107-4
12

Theological Seminary.
PRINCETON, N. J.
Part of the
ADDISON ALEXANDER LIBRARY,
which was presented by
Messrs. R. L. and A. Stuart.

BX 8915 .L3 1835 v.5
Lardner, Nathaniel, 1684-1768.
The works of Nathaniel Lardner

LARDNER'S WORKS.

VOL. V.

THE

WORKS

OF

NATHANIEL LARDNER, D. D.

WITH A LIFE BY DR. KIPPIS.

IN TEN VOLUMES.

VOL. V.

LONDON:
WESTLEY & DAVIS, STATIONERS' COURT.
MDCCCXXXV.

BUNGAY:
STEREOTYPED AND PRINTED BY J. R. AND C. CHILDS.

THEOLOGICAL

CONTENTS OF THE FIFTH VOLUME.

PART II.

CHAP.		A. D.	PAGE
CXXVI.	Prudentius - - - - -	405	3
CXXVII.	Palladius - - - - -	408	6
CXXVIII.	Nonnus - - - - -	410	7
CXXIX.	Isidore of Pelusium - - - -	412	8
CXXX.	Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria - - -	...	13
CXXXI.	Theodoret - - - - -	423	14
CXXXII.	John Cassian - - - - -	424	27
CXXXIII.	Eutherius, Bishop of Tyana - - -	431	33
CXXXIV.	Prosper of Aquitain - - - -	434	36
CXXXV.	Works ascribed to Prosper - - -	...	37
CXXXVI.	Vincentius Lirinensis - - -	434	41
CXXXVII.	Eucherius, Bishop of Lyons - - -	...	52
CXXXVIII.	Cæcilius Sedulius - - - -	...	55
CXXXIX.	Another Sedulius - - - -	818	57
CXL.	Leo, Bishop of Rome - - -	440	62
CXLI.	Salvian - - - - -	...	64
CXLII.	Euthalius, Bishop of Sulca in Egypt - -	458	68
CXLIII.	Dionysius, falsely called the Areopagite -	490	72
CXLIV.	Gennadius - - - - -	494	74
CXLV.	Gelasius, Bishop of Rome - - -	496	75
CXLVI.	Andrew, Bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia -	500	77
CXLVII.	The Alexandrian MSS. and divers Stichometries	...	80
CXLVIII.	Cosmas of Alexandria - - -	535	92
CXLIX.	Facundus, Bishop of Hermiana in Africa -	540	101
CL.	Arethas - - - - -	...	103
CLI.	Arator - - - - -	544	105
CLII.	Junilius - - - - -	550	106
CLIII.	Magnus Aurelius Cassiodorius Senator -	556	109
CLIV.	The Imperfect Work upon St. Matthew -	560	114
CLV.	Victor Tununensis - - - -	566	124
CLVI.	Gregory I. Bishop of Rome - - -	590	126
CLVII.	Isidore, Bishop of Seville - - -	596	135
CLVIII.	Leontius - - - - -	610	141

		A. D.	PAGE
CLIX.	Venerable Bede - - - -	701	144
CLX.	John Damascenus - - - -	730	146
CLXI.	Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople - -	858	150
CLXII.	Œcumenius - - - - -	950	154
CLXIII.	Theophylact - - - - -	1070	157
CLXIV.	Euthymius - - - - -	1110	164
CLXV.	Nicephorus Callisti - - - -	1325	167
	An Appendix, containing an Account of the Ecclesiastical Histories of Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret - - - - - ...		170
	A General Review of the Credibility of the Gospel History, especially of the Second Part - ...		174
	A Recapitulation of the Second Part of the Credibility of the Gospel History - - - ...		183

A HISTORY OF THE APOSTLES AND EVANGELISTS.

I.	General Denominations of the Collection of Sacred Books received by Christians - - - - -	255
II.	General Observations upon the Canon of the New Testament	264
III.	Of the Method in which the Canon of the New Testament has been formed - - - - -	276
IV.	Of the Time of writing the Gospels, especially the first three	281
V.	St. Matthew, Apostle and Evangelist - - -	294
VI.	Of the Time when the Apostles left Judea to go and preach the Gospel in other Countries - - - -	313
VII.	St. Mark, Evangelist - - - - -	325
VIII.	St. Luke, Evangelist - - - - -	350
IX.	St. John, Apostle and Evangelist - - - -	399
X.	The Question considered, whether any of the first three Evangelists had seen the Gospels of the others before he wrote	461
XI.	St. Paul - - - - - - -	472

A PLAN

OF THE

TIMES AND PLACES

OF WRITING THE FOUR GOSPELS, THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES, ST. PAUL'S EPISTLES, THE SEVEN CATHOLIC EPISTLES, AND THE REVELATION.

GOSPELS, &c.	PLACES.		A. D.
St. Matthew's.	Judea, or near it.	about	64
St. Mark's.	Rome.	——	64
St. Luke's.	Greece.	about 63 or	64
St. John's.	Ephesus.	about	68
The Acts of the Apostles.	Greece.	about 63 or	64
EPISTLES.			
To the Romans.	Corinth.	about February	58
1 Corinthians.	Ephesus.	beginning of	56
2 Corinthians.	Macedonia.	about October	57
Galatians.	Corinth or Ephesus.	near the end of or the beginning of	52 53
Ephesians.	Rome.	about April	61
Philippians.	Rome.	before the end of	62
Colossians.	Rome.	before the end of	62
1 Thessalonians.	Corinth.		52
2 Thessalonians.	Corinth.		52
1 Timothy.	Macedonia.		56
2 Timothy.	Rome.	about May	61
Titus.	Macedonia, or near it.	before the end of	56
Philemon.	Rome.	before the end of	62
Hebrews.	Rome, or Italy.	in the spring of	63
Epistle of St. James.	Judea.	61, or beginning of	62
Two Epistles of St. Peter.	Rome.		64
St. John's first Epistle.	Ephesus.	about	80
His second and third Epistles.	Ephesus.	between 80 and	90
Epistle of St. Jude.	Unknown.	64 or	65
The Revelation of St. John.	Patmos, or Ephesus.	95 or	96

A TABLE OF ST. PAUL'S EPISTLES, IN THE ORDER OF TIME, WITH THE PLACES WHERE, AND THE TIMES WHEN, THEY WERE WRITTEN.

EPISTLES.	PLACES.		A. D.
1 Thessalonians.	Corinth.		52
2 Thessalonians.	Corinth.		52
Galatians.	Corinth or Ephesus.	near the end of or the beginning of	52 53
1 Corinthians.	Ephesus.	the beginning of	56
1 Timothy.	Macedonia.		56
Titus.	Macedonia, or near it.	before the end of	56
2 Corinthians.	Macedonia.	about October	57
Romans.	Corinth.	about February	58
Ephesians.	Rome.	about April	61
2 Timothy.	Rome.	about May	61
Philippians.	Rome.	before the end of	62
Colossians.	Rome.	before the end of	62
Philemon.	Rome.	before the end of	62
Hebrews.	Rome, or Italy.	in the spring of	63

THE

CREDIBILITY

OF THE

GOSPEL HISTORY,

OR,

THE PRINCIPAL FACTS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT CONFIRMED BY PASSAGES OF ANCIENT AUTHORS WHO WERE CONTEMPORARY WITH OUR SAVIOUR, OR HIS APOSTLES, OR LIVED NEAR THEIR TIME.

PART II.

THEOLOGICAL

THE

PRINCIPAL FACTS

OF THE

NEW TESTAMENT

CONFIRMED, &c.

PART II. CHAP. CXXVI.

PRUDENTIUS.

1. AURELIUS PRUDENTIUS CLEMENS, an elegant Latin poet, descended of an honourable family, was born at Saragossa in Spain, in the year 348, when Fl. Salia, or Salias, was consul. He[a] wrote the preface to his Cathemerinon, in the fifty-seventh year of his age; as he says himself in that preface, where[b] his other writings also are briefly enumerated: consequently he is well placed as flourishing about the year 405.

2. I put below[c] Gennadius's chapter of Prudentius, in

[a] Per quinquennia jam decem,
Ni failor, fuimus. Septimus insuper
Annum cardo rotat, dum fruimur sole volubili.
— — — — — — —
Inrepsit subito canities seni,
Oblitum veteris me Saliæ Consulis arguens,
Sub quo primi dies mihi.
Cathem. lib. in Præf.

[b] Pugnet contra hæreses: Catholicam discutiat fidem:
Conculcet sacra Gentium:
Labem Roma tuis infcrat idolis:
Carmen martyribus devoveat: Laudet apostolos.
Ibid.

[c] Prudentius, vir seculari literaturâ eruditus, composuit Διτοχαιον, [Διπτυχον,] de toto Veteri et Novo Testamento, personis exceptis. Commentatus est autem

his book of Illustrious Men, published in 494; and I refer to[d] some learned moderns, such as are desirous of a more particular account of this writer.

3. Some have thought that Prudentius was consul; but without any good reason. Others have supposed that he was præfect of the Prætorium, or præfect of Rome: but there is no full proof of either. Gennadius, however, says, that he had a military employment at court. What Prudentius says of himself, in the forementioned preface,[e] I transcribe below: from whence it appears, I think, that for a while he studied the law, and was a pleader; and that he had been a civil magistrate in some cities: after which he took to the profession of arms, and was honoured with some high military preferment under the emperor, either Theodosius, or Honorius: and, before he was very old, he retired from the world.

4. Prudentius celebrates, in his poems,[f] our Lord's nativity, and the circumstances of it; and also, his miracles, death, and resurrection.

in morem Græcorum Hexaëmeron de Mundi Fabricâ usque ad conditionem primi hominis, et prevaricationem ejus. Composuit et libellos, quos Græcâ appellatione attitulavit, Apotheosis, Psychomachia, Hamartigenia, id est, de Divinitate, de Compugnantiâ Animæ, De Origine Peccatorum. Fecit et in Laudem Martyrum, sub aliorum nominibus, invitationem ad Martyrium, librum unum, et Hymnorum alterum: speciali tamen intentione adversus Symmachum, idololatriam defendentem. Ex quorum lectione agnoscitur Palatinus miles fuisse. Gennad. de V. I. cap. 13.

[d] Cav. H. L. T. i. Fabr. ad Gennad. cap. 13. ap. Bib. Ec. Voss. de Hist. Lat. l. ii. c. 10. Tillem. Mem. T. x. Du Pin. Bib. T. iii. p. 5. J. Le Clerc. Bib. Univ. T. xii. p. 135—193. Pagi. Ann. 405. n. 19.

[e] Quid nos utile tanti spatio temporis egimus?
Ætas prima crepantibus
Flevit sub ferulis. . . .
— — — — — —
Exin jurgia turbidos
Armârunt animos, et male pertinax
Vincendi studium subjacuit casibus asperis.
Bis legum moderamine
Frenos nobilium reximus urbium;
Jus civile bonis reddidimus, terruimus reos.
Tandem militiæ gradu
Evectum pietas principis extulit,
Adsumtum propius stare jubens ordine proximo.
Cathem. Præf.

[f] O beatus ortus ille, virgo cum puerpera
Edidit nostram salutem, fœta Sancto Spiritu.
— — — — — —
Cantharis infusa lympha fit Falernum nobile.
Nuntiat vinum minister esse promtum ex hydriâ.
Ipse rex sapore tinctis obstupescit poculis, &c.
Cathem. Hymn. ix. ver. 19, &c. Vid. et Cath. Hymn. xii.

5. There is a book, called his Enchiridion, consisting of small poems, celebrating many remarkable events of the Old and the New Testament. Those of the New are taken out of the gospels, the Acts, and[g] the Revelation.

6. Some have hesitated about the genuineness of that work, because it is not taken notice of by Prudentius in the preface before cited: nevertheless, it is particularly mentioned by Gennadius, by the title of Diptychon. Whether it be genuine, or not, the same things occur in the other unquestioned writings of Prudentius.

7. In particular, the[h] Revelation is plainly referred to in some of the hymns in the Cathemerinon. And he seems to have supposed, that[i] St. John had his visions in sleep.

8. I add one thing more: Prudentius[k] considers martyrs as intercessors; and hopes, through them, to obtain of Christ the forgiveness of his sins.

[g] Bis duodena senum sedes, pateris citharisque,
Totque coronarum fulgens insignibus, agnum,
Cæde cruentatum laudat: qui evolvere librum,
Et septem potuit signacula pandere solus.
Enchir. Num. 49. seu ult.

[h] Corde fusus ex Parentis, ante mundi exordium
Alpha et Ω cognominatus: ipse fons et clausula
Omnium, quæ sunt, fuerunt, quæque post futura sunt.
Cathem. Hymn. ix. 5. 10—12. Vid. Apoc. i. 8.

[i] O quam profunda justis
Arcana per soporem
Aperit tuenda Christus!
Quam clara, quam tacenda,
Evangelista summi
Fidissimus magistri,
— — — — —
Nebulis vides remotis, &c.
Cathem. Hymn. vi. v. 73. &c.
Tali sopore justus
Mentem relaxat heros,
Ut spiritu sagaci
Cœlum peragret omne.
Ibid. ver. 112, &c.

[k] Hos inter, O Christi decus,
Audi poëtam rusticum,
Cordis fatentem crimina,
Et facta prodentem sua.
Indignus agnosco et scio,
Quem Christus ipse exaudiat;
Sed per patronos martyres
Potest medelam consequi.
Περι στεφανων. Hymn. vi.
In laudem Laurentii. ver. 573—580.

CHAP. CXXVII.

PALLADIUS.

1. IN the chapter of St. Jerom,[a] I have quoted Palladius, bishop of Helenopolis in Bithynia, author of the Lausiac History; and Palladius, author of a Dialogue of the Life of St. Chrysostom, written in 408. Whether they are different, or one and the same, is a question debated by many[b] learned men; particularly by[c] Du Pin, who reckons them one and the same; by[d] Tillemont and[e] Fabricius, who think them to be different. I do not think it needful now to produce distinctly the reasons on either side. I here intend only to make some extracts out of the forementioned Dialogue, composed at Rome in 408, soon after the death of St. Chrysostom, by Palladius, friend of that bishop.

2. In this Dialogue, the gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the epistles, and particularly[f] the epistle to the Hebrews, are freely quoted.

3. He[g] quotes the epistle to the Ephesians with that title.

4. He[h] has the words of 2 Pet. ii. 3, and quotes the epistle of St. Jude, expressly transcribing ver. 12, 13.

5. A large part of St. John's third epistle is here quoted, in this manner: 'As[i] in the catholic epistles, the blessed John writes to Gaius, against a certain bishop; commending the hospitality of Gaius, and exhorting him not to imitate such bishops as were wicked.'

6. These things deserve our notice. St. Chrysostom, as we saw in his chapter, received only three of the catholic epistles: that of James; the first of Peter; the first of

[a] See Vol. iv. ch. cxiv.

[b] Vid. Cav. H. L. T. i. Emer. Bigot. in Pr. ad. Dialog.

[c] Pallade. Du Pin. Bib. des Aut. Ecc. T. iii. p. 92, 93.

[d] Tillem. Pallade, art. 12. Mem. T. xi.

[e] Solet a multis longo jam tempore Palladio huic tribui Dialogus de Vitâ S. Chrysostomi, qui cum Theodoro Diacono Romano habitus Romæ fingitur circa ann. 408, non diu post Chrysostomi mortem. Auctorem Dialogi a Palladio Lausiacæ scriptore recte distinguunt Baronius A. 388. n. 110. Emericus Bigotius in Prefat. ad Dialogum, et Tillemontius. Fabr. Bib. Gr. l. v. c. 32. sect. 4. T. ix. p. 8.

[f] Καθως νȣθετων Ἑβραιȣς λεγει ὁ μεγαλοφρων Παυλος. Dialog. cap. 1. p. 2. E. ap. S. Chrysost. Opp. T. xiii. Vid. et p. 45. D. et p. 75. et passim.

[g] Cap. 18. p. 71. F.

[h] Οἱς το κριμα ȣκ αργει, και ἡ απολεια αυτων ȣ νυϛαζει·—περι ὡν Ιȣδας, αδελφος Ιακωβȣ, φησιν· Οὑτοι εισιν οἱ εν ταις αγαπαις ὑμων σπιλαδες. Dial. c. 18. p. 68. C. D.

[i] Καθως εν ταις καθολικαις γραφει Γαϊῳ ὁ μακαριος Ιωαννης, κ. λ. Ib. cap. 20. p. 79.

John. But this writer, though a friend and admirer of St. Chrysostom, quotes the second epistle of Peter, the epistle of Jude, and the third of John; and therefore, probably, received all the seven catholic epistles. This shows, that there were then different sentiments about some books of scripture. Men seem to have indulged a liberty of judging for themselves: and they determined, as the evidence appeared to them. And it is chiefly for the sake of these quotations, that I have made a distinct article of Palladius.

7. Whether he received the book of the Revelation, does not appear.

8. He has these expressions: 'The[k] chief-shepherd himself; and chief-master, and chief-sophist, Jesus Christ; the reformer of the human error.'

CHAP. CXXVIII.

NONNUS.

1. NONNUS, of Panapolis, in Egypt, flourished, according to Cave,[a] about 410; according to[b] Mill, in the beginning of the fifth century. Du Pin says, 'his[c] time is not exactly known. 'All we can say, is, that he lived after Gregory 'Nazianzen, and before the reign of Justinian.'

2. He wrote in Greek verse a paraphrase of St. John's gospel, still extant. Some various readings have been observed in him. The principal is, that he has not the history of the woman taken in adultery and brought before our Saviour, which we now have at the beginning of the eighth chapter of St. John's Gospel. Moreover, in chap. xix. 14, he seems to have read[d] 'about the third hour,' where we have "about the sixth hour:" concerning which, may be seen, Mill, Bengelius, J. J. Wetstein, Wolfius, and others, upon the place, and elsewhere.

[k] *Αυτος ὁ αρχιποιμην και αρχιδιδασκαλος και αρχισοφιστης Ιησους ὁ Χριστος, ὁ της ανθρωπινης πλανης διορθωτης,* κ. λ. cap. 12. p. 47. A.

[a] Vid. Cav. H. L. T. i. Fabr. Bib. Gr. l. v. c. 16. T. vii. p. 682, &c.

[b] Prolegom. ad. N. T. 908, &c. [c] Bibl. des Aut. Ecc. T. iii. P. ii. p. 77.

[d] *Εκτη δ', ἡν ενεπεσι προσαββατον, επλετο ηως.*
Ην δε τιταινομενη τριτατη θανατοφορος ὡρη. Nonn.

CHAP. CXXIX.

ISIDORE OF PELUSIUM.

I. *His time.* II. *His works.* III. *Select passages.* IV. *Books of the Old and New Testament received by him.* V. *His respect for the scriptures, and exhortations to read and study them.* VI. *Various readings, and observations upon scripture.*

I. ISIDORE, of Pelusium in Egypt, is spoken of by [a] Mill, next after Nonnus, as being his contemporary: and he is placed, by [b] Cave, at the year 412. Basnage[c] speaks of him at the year 427: it is likely, that he died before the middle of the fifth century. Pagi says, We[d] hear nothing of him after the year 433.

II. Facundus says, he[e] wrote two thousand epistles for the edification of the church: Suidas says[f] 'three thou-'sand, explaining the divine scriptures.' There are still extant above two thousand; but they are most of them very short, and not a few of them coincident, treating the same question, and in a like manner. Dr. Heumann[g] has a Dissertation on Isidore, of Pelusium, which well deserves to be read. He rectifies divers mistakes of learned moderns; and argues, that[h] most of his letters are fictitious, and not a real correspondence: and he seems to have proved what he advances.

III. I shall, in the first place, take some select passages of Isidore; and then observe his testimony to the scriptures.

1. 'A[i] cloak and staff,' says he, 'do not make a philosopher; but freedom of speech, and a suitable life; in like

[a] Proleg. n. 916, &c. [b] H. L. T. i. Conf. Fabr. Bib. Gr. l. v. c. 34. T. ix. p. 253, &c. Du Pin. T. iii. p. 2. Tillem. Mem. T. 15.

[c] Ann. 427. n. 5. [d] Post hunc annum nulla amplius occurrit mentio sancti Isidori Pelusiotæ, &c. Ann. 433. n. 23.

[e] Isidorus, Presbyter Ægyptius Pelusiota, quem duo millia epistolarum ad ædificationem ecclesiæ multi scripsisse noverunt. Facund. l. iii. c. 4.

[f] V. Ισιδωρος. [g] De Isidoro Pelusiotâ et ejus epistolis. Diss. xv. ap. Primatias Gottingenses, Hanover, 1738. 4to.

[h] —— plerasque esse fictitias, ac rhetorico more conscriptas, non ut ii, quorum præfixa sunt nomina, eas acciperent, legerentque, sed ut specimina essent eloquentiæ iis imitandæ, quos haberet Isidorus artis dicendi discipulos. Ib. n. 9. p. 222. Cæterum etsi fictitiæ sunt hæ epistolæ, ficta tamen non sunt quæ in iis leguntur, sed ex animi sententiâ scripta ab Isidoro. Ib. n. 13. p. 228.

[i] Ὡσπερ τον φιλοσοφον ȣχ' ἡ ϛολη και ἡ βακτηρια δεικνυσιν, αλλ' ἡ παῤῥησια και ἡ πολιτεια· ȣτω και τον χριϛιανον ȣ σχημα και λογος, αλλα τροπος και βιος τῳ ορθῳ λογῳ εφαμιλλος. L. iv. Ep. 34.

manner, habit and profession do not make a christian; but a life and conversation agreeable to right reason.'

2. 'Nothing[k] is so dear to God as love: for the sake of which he became man, and was obedient unto death. And the first two disciples, called by our all-wise Saviour, were brothers; to show, that all his disciples should live together in a brotherly manner.'

3. 'It[l] was not, my dear friend, because our Lord foresaw the design of Judas, that he was guilty of treachery; but because that wretch had conceived the design to betray him, therefore he, who knew the secret motions of the heart, spake before-hand of future things, as if they were present.'

4. 'You[m] seem to wonder, that Christ did not persuade the traitor to the love of virtue, when he heard him so often speaking of it in his discourses; or rather of nothing else. On[n] the other hand, I think it strange, that you should wonder at it, when you know the powers of free-will: for man's salvation is not accomplished by force and violence, but by gentleness and persuasion. Therefore, the salvation of every man is in his own power; that they who are rewarded, and they who are punished, may justly receive what they have chosen.

5. He says, 'that[o] piety is natural to us; that[p] the human nature has in it seeds of goodness. Men[q] are neither above temptation, nor is evil natural to them; but for want of due care they fall from virtue, as did the first man.' To the like purpose in other places; to some of which[r] I refer.

6. He[s] sometimes argues very well for our Saviour's resurrection, and the truth of the christian religion, against both Jews and Gentiles.

7. He[t] magnifies the progress of the christian religion, notwithstanding many difficulties, by unlikely instruments.

[k] L. i. Ep. 10. [l] L. i. Ep. 57. [m] L. ii. Ep. 129.

[n] Εγω δε θαυμαζω, πως τον ορον της αυτεξουσιοτητος επισαμενος, περι τουτου εθαυμασας. Ου γαρ βια και τυραννιδι, αλλα πειθοι και προσηνειᾳ ἡ των ανθρωπων σωτηρια κατασκευαζεται. Διο και το κυρος εχει εκαστος της οικειας σωτηριας· ινα και οι στεφανουμενοι, και οι τιμωρουμενοι, δικαιως ὑπομενοιεν ὁπερ ἡρηνται. Ibid. [o] Ὁτι φυσικως εστιν εν ἡμιν ευσεβεια. L. i. Ep. 431.

[p] Ει παλαι ειχεν ἡ των ανθρωπων φυσις τα εις καλοκαγαθιαν σπερματα, κ. λ. L. ii. Ep. 2. in. Conf. Ep. 167. [q] Ἡ φυσις ἡ ανθρωπεια, θαυμασιε, ουτε ανεπιδεκτος εστι κακων, ουτε φυσικως κεκτηται τα κακα, αλλα γνωμῃ ναι ραθυμιᾳ την αποπτωσιν ὑπομενει των χρηστων· ὁπερ και ὁ πρωτος πεπονθεν ανθρωπος. L. iii. Ep. 303. [r] Vid. l. i. Ep. 435, 436. l. ii. Ep. 72. et 79. l. iii. 335. l. iv. Ep. 12. et 51.

[s] L. i. i. Ep. 18. l. ii. Ep. 99. l. iv. Ep. 27, 30, 31.

[t] L. i. Ep. 168, 170. l. ii. Ep. 251. l. iii. Ep. 182.

IV. Isidore has largely quoted all, or most of the canonical books of the Old Testament. Apocryphal books are quoted by him very seldom.

1. He says, there[u] are three books of Solomon; and that they should be read in this order: first, the Proverbs; then Ecclesiastes; and, last of all, the Canticles. He who has well digested the first two, may read the third safely and profitably.

2. He[v] calls the author of the book of Ecclesiasticus, a certain wise man. It is likely, that is the highest character which he ascribed to him; and not that of prophet.

3. He often quotes the four gospels; the Acts of the Apostles; and all St. Paul's epistles, except that to Philemon.

4. The[w] Acts of the Apostles is ascribed by him to Luke, as the writer.

5. He several times quotes[x] the Epistle to the Hebrews, and[y] as Paul's.

6. He likewise quotes all, or most of the catholic Epistles. However, to be here a little more particular, may not be improper.

7. He[z] quotes and explains passages of the Epistle of James, expressly calling it his. He quotes[a] the first, and[b] the second Epistle of Peter; as also the[c] first Epistle of John. He[d] explains the eighth verse of the second Epistle of John: there can be no reason to doubt whether he received the other. He[e] explains a passage of the Epistle of Jude.

8. He[f] has several expressions which seem to be taken from the book of the Revelation; though I do not recollect that he has any where mentioned the title of the book, or the name of the writer.

9. If Isidore received the book of the Revelation, (which may be reckoned probable,) his canon of scripture was the same as ours.

[u] L. iv. Ep. 40.

[v] *Σοφος τις ανηρ, ὁ τȣ Σιραχ, φημι, ὁ την Σοφιαν εκεινην συγγραψας.* L. iv. Ep. 228.

[w] *Βλεπε και των μεγαλοφρονα και Θεοφορον Λȣκαν τον Ἡρωδȣ τυφον ἱστορȣντα, κ. λ.* L. i. Ep. 74. Conf. ib. Ep. 500. *Λȣκȣ τȣ παναριστȣ Λȣκα εν ταις Πραξεσι γεγραφοτος.* L. i. Ep. 448.

[x] L. iv. Ep. 12. p. 473. D.

[y] L. i. Ep. 7. Vid. ib. Ep. 94. et 234.

[z] L. i. Ep. 93. Conf. l. ii. Ep. 158. et l. iv. Ep. 10. et 65.

[a] L. i. Ep. 119. et 139. l. iv. Ep. 218. l. v. Ep. 362.

[b] L. i. Ep. 140, 143, 188.

[c] L. i. Ep. 58.

[d] L. ii. Ep. 380.

[e] L. iv. Ep. 58.

[f] *Ὁ μισθος μετ' αυτȣ εστιν, ὁν ἑκαστος ληψεται προς τον ἰδιον κοπον.* [Vid. Apoc. xxii. 12.] L. i. Ep. 13. *Ει ὁ ȣρανος ως βιβλιον ελισσεται, και τα ἀστρα πιπτει, κ. λ.* [Vid. Apoc. vi. 13, 14.] L. i. Ep. 188. Vid. et l. ii. Ep. 175.

V. He had a great respect for the scriptures, and often recommends the reading of them.

1. Writing to a heathen, or supposed heathen, he says: 'Two[g] volumes, one called the Old, the other the New, Testament, which I have sent to you, are sufficient to teach you our religion.' In another letter[h] he shows the complete harmony of the Old and the New Testament, or the law and the prophets, and the gospel. He calls the scriptures,[i] the divine Oracles;[k] the divine and heavenly Oracles: the[l] sacred gospels is another expression of his. He speaks very honourably of Paul, calling him[m] a most wise instructor; and[n] the excellent apostle. 'Some,'[o] he says, 'blame the divine scriptures, because they have not all the ornaments of eloquence to be found in some heathen writings; but we know that is no disparagement to them. Those admired authors, among the Greeks, sought their own glory; but the truly divine scriptures aim at the salvation of men. The scriptures teach true religion in a plain style; that the ignorant as well as the knowing, and even children and women, may understand. Nor is that any injury to the knowing: whereas the contrary method would have been detrimental to the greatest part of the world. And, by consulting the benefit of the most, or rather of all, the scriptures evidently manifest themselves to be divine and heavenly.'

2. I refer to divers other places, where[p] he exhorts to the reading the scriptures, or[q] commends them; and lays down rules for the right reading them, so as to understand them. James Basnage says, 'All[r] that can be offered upon 'this subject, may be seen in Isidore of Pelusium.'

VI. 1. He[s] had the first chapter of St. Matthew's gospel; and says, that[t] the sacred volume of the gospels brings down the genealogy of Joseph from David; and

[g] Την ἡμετεραν δε θρησκειαν δυο πυκται διδαξουσιν, ὰς επεμψαμην, ὡν ἡ μεν πρεσβυτερα, ἡ δε νεα διαθηκη προσαγορευεται. L. i. Ep. 7.

[h] L. i. Ep. 107. [i] Θειοι χρησμοι. L. i. Ep. 5.

[k] Οἱ θειοι και ὡραιοι χρησμοι. L. iii. Ep. 138.

[l] —— εν τοις ἱεροις ευαγγελιοις. L. iv. Ep. 216.

[m] —— παρα Παυλε τε σοφε διδασκαλε. L. i. Ep. 49.

[n] Φιλιππησιοις γραφει ὁ θειος αποστολος. L. i. Ep. 139.
Και ὁ θεσπεσιος Παυλος. L. iv. Ep. 88. [o] L. iv. Ep. 67.

[p] Αναγινωσκειν τας γραφας οφειλεις, και μη περι παντων ερωταν. L. iii. Ep. 13. in. [q] L. i. Ep. xxiv. 369, 449. l. ii. Ep. v. 297. l. iii. Ep. 125, 338. l. iv. Ep. 33, 61, 91, 133, 140. l. v. Ep. 281.

[r] Hist. de l'Eglise. l. ix. ch. 2. sect. 7. fin.

[s] Vid. l. i. Ep. 18. [t] Ἡ μεν ἱερα των ευαγγελιων πυκτη, κ. λ. L. i. Ep. 7.

thereby shows that Mary likewise was of the tribe of Judah.

2. Isidore[u] had the doxology at the end of the Lord's Prayer.

3. He explains[v] Rom. i. 32, according to our present common reading, which he prefers. But some were rather for the other; 'and not only they who do them, but they also who have pleasure in them that do them:' and they said it was the ancient reading. I do not suppose that Philo ever read any of St. Paul's epistles; but there is in him a passage very agreeable to the sense of this last mentioned reading. 'They[w] are wicked,' says he, 'not only 'that do such things, but they also who willingly approve of 'those who do them:' however, his expressions are very different from St. Paul's. Philo, in 'approving,' seems to include flattery.

4. As some unbelievers absurdly and wickedly deny the prophets to have spoken at all of Christ, so he thinks 'they[x] are blameable, who endeavour to explain all the Old Testament as relating to him; for, by forced applications of texts, which do not speak of Christ, they cause those to be suspected, where he is really intended; and so hurt the cause of truth, and strengthen the adversary.'

5. They[y] excellent Paul, though enriched with spiritual gifts, employed some time in reading; and therefore he writes to that eminent disciple of his; "Give attendance to reading." 1 Tim. iv. 13.

6. Some,[z] in his time, wore about them small gospels, or some portions of the gospels; which he blames, as resembling the Jewish superstition, in wearing phylacteries. This kind of superstition we have already seen censured by[a] Jerom, and[b] Chrysostom.

[u] L. iv. Ep. 24. fin.

[v] L. iv. Ep. 60. Conf. l. v. Ep. 74. et 159.

[w] *Ασεβεσι γαρ εχ' οἱ ὁρωντες μονοι, αλλα και ὑσοι τοις ὁρωσιν ἑκασιῳ γνωμῃ συν τῃ των ὁρωντων εξεσιᾳ συνεπιγραφονται.* De Special. Leg. p. 779. C.

[x] —— *ετως τες πασαν παλαιαν εις αυτον μεταφερειν πειρωμενες εκ εξω αιτιας τιθημι.—Τῳ γαρ ελεγχεσθαι παρ' εκεινων περι τετε μη ειρημενα εις αυτον ελκειν εκβιαζομενοι, τετων και τοις περι αυτε αληθως και διαῤῥηδην ειρημενοις ὑπονοιαν τικτεσι.* L. iii. Ep. 339. Conf. l. i. Ep. 107. l. ii. Ep. 195.

[y] *Και ο θεσπεσιος Παυλος, και τοις πνευματικοις κομων χαρισμασι, της αναγνωσεως ε μικραν εποιειτο σπεδην. Διο και τῳ ζηλωτῃ αυτε τω περιβλεπτῳ εγραφε· προσεχε τῃ αναγνωσει.* L. 4. Ep. 88. in.

[z] —— *απερ εφορων οἱ των Ιεδαιων καθηγηται, ὡσπερ νυν αἱ γυναικες τα ευαγγελια τα μικρα.* L. ii. Ep. 150.

[a] Vol. iv. ch. cxiv. sub. fin.

[b] Vol. iv. ch. cxviii.

CHAP. CXXX.

CYRIL, BISHOP OF ALEXANDRIA.

1. CYRIL,[a] born at Alexandria, was made bishop of his native city in the year 412. Beside other things, he wrote Commentaries upon the five books of Moses, Isaiah, the twelve lesser prophets, and St. John's gospel.

2. It is needless to say, that all the books of the New Testament, commonly received, are frequently quoted by him: I therefore observe only a few things.

3. The epistle to the Hebrews is often quoted in Cyril's works, as written by Paul.

4. The epistle of James also is often quoted by him; once after this manner: 'As[b] says a disciple of Christ.'

5. The second epistle of Peter is quoted by Cyril[c] sometimes.

6. Once at least he has quoted[d] the second epistle of John: whether the third also I cannot say certainly.

7. The epistle of Jude is quoted by him[e] divers times.

8. The book of the Revelation is quoted as St. John's[f] several times; once after this manner: 'This[g] we are taught by the wise man John, who wrote the book of the Revelation, which has had the approbation of the fathers.' Possibly that expression may denote, that the Revelation was a book about which there were disputes or different opinions.

9. From these quotations we may perceive that Cyril received all the books of the New Testament which we do; nor did he receive any other.

[a] Vid. Cav. H. L. Du Pin. Bib. T. iv. Tillem. Mem. T. xiv. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. viii. p. 553, &c. Pagi in Baron. an. 412. n. 23, 24, et passim. Basnag. Ann. 412. n. 12. et alibi. Et Conf. Socrat. H. E. l. vii. c. 17. 13—15.

[b] —— λεγων ὁ Χριστε μαθητης. De Adorat. in Spirit. et Verit. l. i. T. i. p. 10. E. Par. 1638.

[c] Αλλα τουτων ἁπαντων λυομενων, καθα και τε σωτηρος ἐϊσχυρισατο μαθητης, ποταπες δει εὑρεθηναι ἡμας. [2 Pet. iii. 11.] Ib. l. ix. p. 288. A. Vid. et Glaph. in Exod. l. iii. T. i. P. ii. p. 329. A. Thesaur. T. v. P. i. p. 368. C. De Rectâ Fid. T. v. P. ii. p. 77.

[d] Τοις τοιουτοις μηδε χαιρειν λεγετε, φησι τε σωτηρος ἡμων μαθητης, κ. λ. De Ador. in Spirit. et Verit. l. viii. T. i. p. 255. E.

[e] Τι γαρ Ιουδας ἡμιν επιστελλει, τε σωτηρος ὁ μαθητης; κ. λ. In Joan. Ev. l. ix. T. iv. p. 798. C. Vid. et Thesaur. T. v. p. 302. C. De Rectâ Fid. T. v. P. ii. p. 77.

[f] Ταυτης γαρ ἑνεκα της αιτιας οιηθειην αν εγωγε, τον Ιωαννην ειπειν. Ὁ ων, ὁ ην, ὁ ερχομενος. Glaph. in Exod. l. ii. T. i. P. ii. p. 273. A. Vid. et Thesaur. T. v. P. i. p. 20. et p. 149. C.

[g] Καιτοι το της Αποκαλυψεως βιβλιον ημιν συντιθεις ὁ σοφος Ιωαννης, ὁ και ταις των πατερων τετιμηται ψηφοις, κ. λ. De Adorat. in Sp. et Verit. l. vi. T. i. p. 188. A.

10. We meet with the Lord's prayer in[h] Cyril exactly as we now have it in St. Matthew; except that it wants the doxology.

11. Cyril commends all the evangelists; but[i] speaks of John as superior to the rest: he likewise calls him,[k] the Divine.

12. He[l] recommends the studying of the scriptures; and says, 'that[m] from the holy prophets, apostles, and evangelists, we may learn how to attain to piety, and may secure to ourselves true peace of mind.'

13. I formerly referred[n] to several places of Cyril, for an explication of 2 Thess. ii. 1—12; and many good interpretations of texts of the New Testament may be found in him; but I forbear to take any notice of them at present.

14. How this bishop of Alexandria treated the Novatians, in his diocese, was shown some while ago,[o] from Socrates.

CHAP. CXXXI.

THEODORET.

I. *His time.* II. *His works.* III. *Books of the Old Testament received by him.* IV. *Books of the New Testament received by him.* V. *General titles and divisions of the scriptures.* VI. *Marks of respect for them, and exhortations to read them.* VII. *Explications of texts, and remarkable observations.* VIII. *The swift and wonderful progress of the Gospel.*

I. THEODORET,[a] as is computed, was born at Antioch, about 386; made bishop of Cyrus, in Syria, in the Euphratesian province, in 420, or 423; and died in 457, or 458.

[h] De Adorat. in Sp. et Verit. l. xiii. T. i. p. 471. E.

[i] In Joan. T. iv. p. 8. A.

[k] Ο Θεολογος. Ib. p. 87. E.

[l] Glaph. in Gen. l. i. in. T. i. p. 2.

[m] Πηγας δε φαμεν εν τουτοις τους αγιους προφητας, αποστολους τε και ευαγγελιστας· οις ενομιλουντες σαφως τε, και εντεχνως, αρυομεθα παρ' αυτων ζωοποιον τε και θειον λογον, αποχρωντως εχοντα προς το δυνασθαι διανευρειν εις ευσεβειαν τας ημετερας ψυχας, και τρυφην ημιν εργαζεσθαι την πνευματικην. In Es. T. ii. p. 671. B.

[n] See Vol. iii. ch. lxi.

[o] Ibid. p. 104.

[a] Vid. Sirmond. Garner. Cav. H. L. Fabric. Bib. Gr. T. vii. p. 430, &c. Du Pin, Bib. T. 4. Tillem. Mem. T. xv. Pagi Ann. 423. n. 8, 9, 427. n. 9, 10, 11, 18, 19, et passim. Basn. Ann. 424. n. 9, 10, et alibi.

II. Beside his Ecclesiastical History, and divers other useful works, he wrote Commentaries upon most parts of the sacred scripture; particularly, the five books of Moses, Joshua, the Judges, Ruth, Samuel, the Kings, the Chronicles, the Psalms, the Canticles, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Baruch, the Lamentations, Ezekiel, Daniel, the twelve lesser prophets, and St. Paul's fourteen epistles.

Most of the writings ascribed to him are generally allowed to be his; but Pagi,[b] and some others say, the letter to Sporacius was not written by him: and the late Mr. Barratier[c] disputes the genuineness of[d] the Dialogues on the Incarnation, and of the Philotheus; and he seems to me to have proved those Dialogues to be supposititious. As for the Philotheus, it is unquestioned that Theodoret wrote a book with that title; it is referred to, and quoted by him, several times, in his Ecclesiastical History. But Mr. Barratier asserts, that the Philotheus, which we have, was not written by Theodoret; he says, that divers things are wanting in our copy, which were in the original work, and other things have been added: moreover there are in it many mistakes in historical facts, unworthy of Theodoret, and contrary to what he writes in his Ecclesiastical History. Upon the whole, if Mr. Barratier has not demonstrated this point, what he says is material, and deserves the consideration of the learned. As both those writings, therefore, may be reckoned doubtful, I shall never take any thing from them, without giving particular notice of it.

III. 1. He speaks[e] of the great care, which Ezra had taken, to publish exact copies of the sacred scriptures of the Old Testament, one hundred and fifty years before the Greek version had been made by the Seventy. In another place he supposeth, that[f] Ezra restored all the books of the Old Testament, which had been lost. Though that be not a right sentiment, I observe, that the books here mentioned by him, are the five books of Moses, Joshua, the Judges, the Kings, Job, David's Psalms, the sixteen prophets: and three books of Solomon, the Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Canticles; which passage alone is sufficient to show what was Theodoret's canon of the Old Testament.

[b] Ann. 428. n. 21. et seq.

[c] Dissertation sur quelques écrits de Théodoret Evêque de Cyr, par Mr. Barratier. See Bibliothéque Germanique, T. xlviii. p. 50—99.

[d] Eranistes, seu Polymorphus. Dialogi tres. T. iv. Paris. 1642.

[e] Præf. in Psalm. T. i. p. 396. B.

[f] Præf. in Cant. T. i. p. 985.

2. He[g] vindicates the spirituality, and the divine mystery, of the book of Canticles.

3. Theodoret explains Baruch; but his Commentary concludes[h] with the end of the fifth chapter: he takes no notice of the epistle of Jeremiah, in the sixth chapter of that book, as it is divided by us.

4. In his Commentary upon Daniel, he takes no notice of the stories of Susannah, or of Bel and the Dragon, as is owned by[i] Tillemont; but[k] he has the Song of the Three Children, inserted in the third chapter of the book of Daniel.

5. He says, that[l] Ezekiel was the last prophet, during the captivity; and that Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, prophesied after the return. Again, he says: After[m] the return from the captivity, the Jewish people had but three prophets, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi: and then the gift of prophecy ceased among them: but after the coming of our Saviour, and after his ascension, the Holy Ghost came down upon the holy apostles, and by them the like gift was bestowed, not upon the Jews only, but also upon all the Gentiles that believed. In another place, he says: 'As[n] Moses is the first who committed to writing the divine oracles; so Malachi is the last of the prophets that wrote.'

6. Whence it is apparent, that Theodoret's canon of the Old Testament was very little, if at all, different from that of the Jews.

7. We plainly perceive, from Theodoret as well as from others, that[o] what we call the books of the Kings, were in those times generally called, the books of the Kingdoms.

8. He thinks it probable, that[p] the books of the Chronicles were written after the return from the Babylonish captivity.

IV. 1. It is almost needless to observe, that[q] Theodoret received four gospels only; of[r] which we saw good proof formerly: or, that[s] he received the book of the Acts, and

[g] Præf. in Cant. p. 984.
[h] Vid. T. ii. p. 285, 286.
[i] Theodoret. Art. xlv. Mem. T. xv.
[k] Vid. T. ii. p. 578, &c.
[l] In Ezech. T. ii. p. 304. D.
[m] In Ezech. ib. p. 501. A. B.
[n] Præf. in Malach. T. ii. p. 931. B.
[o] In Judic. T. i. p. 208. B. Conf. p. 229, 230.
[p] In Paral. T. i. p. 364. A. B.
[q] *Ταυτα οἱ τεσσαρες εναγγελισται συνεγραψαν.* Ep. 130. T. iii. p. 1003. C. *Μαρτυρες οἱ τεσσαρες εναγγελισται· ἁπαντες γαρ συμφωνως ταυτο διδασκασιν.* Ep. 145. p. 1019. D. *Και διδασκει ἡμας διαῤῥηδην των ἱερων εναγγελιων ἡ τετρακτυς.* Ep. 145. p. 1026. B.
[r] See Vol. i. ch. xiii.
[s] Upon Col. iv. 14. T. iii. p. 363. he says: 'This person wrote the divine

ascribed it to St. Luke; or that he had received fourteen epistles of the apostle Paul, upon which he wrote Commentaries, still extant, as before mentioned.

2. Theodoret has digested St. Paul's epistles, according to the order of time in which they were written; and has observed, likewise, the places from which they were sent.

'I will show,'[t] says he, 'the order of the apostle's epistles: The blessed Paul wrote fourteen epistles; but[u] I do not think that he assigned them that order which we now have in our Bibles. The epistle written by the divine Paul to the Romans, stands first in order; nevertheless, it is the last of those which were sent from Asia, Macedonia, and Achaia: the two epistles first written are, the two epistles to the Thessalonians; next, the two epistles to the Corinthians: the fifth, in order of time, is the first to Timothy; the next, is that to Titus: the epistle to the Romans is the seventh. The other epistles were sent from Rome; the first of these I take to be that to the Galatians. From Rome likewise he sent the epistles to the Philippians, and that to the Ephesians, and to the Colossians, in which last he also mentions Onesimus: for which reason the epistle to Philemon may be supposed to have been written before, for in it he desires, that Onesimus may be received; afterwards he wrote the epistle to the Hebrews, and from Rome, as the conclusion shows: "They of Italy salute you." The last of all his epistles is the second to Timothy. This is the order of the epistles in point of time. The epistle to the Romans has been placed first, as containing the most full and exact representation of the christian doctrine, in all its branches; but some say, that it has been so placed out of respect to the city to which it was sent, as presiding over the whole world.'

3. Theodoret's preface to his Commentary upon the epistle to the Ephesians, deserves to be carefully read. At the end of that preface, he says: 'The[v] former part of the epistle contains the doctrine of the gospel; the latter part, a moral admonition.' That may be said in some measure of most of St. Paul's epistles; but it is more especially manifest in this.

4 In a note upon Eph. i. 15, 16, he says: 'Some[w] argued

gospel, and the history of the Acts. Ουτος και το θειον συνεγραψε ευαγγελιον, και την ιστοριαν των πραξεων. The book of the Acts is very often quoted by Theodoret, and as written by St. Luke.

[t] Præf. in Ep. S. P. T. iii. p. 2. D. et p. 3, 4, 5, 6.

[u] Την δε ταξιν, ην εν τοις βιβλιοις εχουσιν, ουκ αυτον ηγεμαι πεποιηκεναι. Ib. p. 2. D.

[v] Pr. in Ep. ad Eph. T. iii. p. 292. C.

[w] T. iii. p. 293. D.

from thence, that the apostle had not yet seen the Ephesians, when he wrote that epistle to them;' but he does not allow their argument to be good.

5. It may be here observed, that Theodoret always cites the epistle to the Ephesians by that title.

6. In the preface to the epistle to the Colossians, he says: Some[x] have been of opinion, that the apostle had not seen those christians, when he wrote to them: and they endeavoured to support their own opinion by these expressions, ch. ii. 1; but he says, they do not rightly interpret the words, the meaning of which is, that he was not concerned for them only, but likewise for those who had not seen him; he says, therefore: 'I would ye should know, how great concern I have for you, and for them of Laodicea; and for as many as have not seen my face in the flesh.' He farther argues it to be very likely, from the history in the Acts, that the apostle had been at Colosse: so he argues again, in his comment upon[y] Col. ii. 1; and[z] iv. 10.

7. Upon Col. iv. 16, he says: 'Some[a] have hence imagined, that the apostle had also written to the Laodiceans, and they had forged such an epistle; but the apostle does not say the epistle to the Laodiceans, but from Laodicea; for they had written to him about some things: probably, they had informed him of some things amiss among the Colossians; whilst the like faults were to be found with them also: therefore, he directs, that this epistle should be likewise read to them.'

8. It is surprising to observe, how seldom[b] Theodoret has quoted the catholic epistles—they are not quite overlooked; they are quoted: but all his quotations of them might be placed, at full length, in a little room. It was formerly shown, that[c] there are but few quotations of the catholic epistles, either in Theodoret or Chrysostom.

9. He[d] quotes the epistle of St. James. In his comment upon Gal. i. 19, he says, that[e] James, the Lord's brother, was not so literally; nor was he the son of Joseph, by a former marriage, as some have thought; but he was the son of Cleophas, who had married the sister of our Lord's mother: he was, therefore, cousin-german to our Lord.

10. Theodoret has several times quoted[f] the first epistle

[x] T. iii. p. 342, 343. [y] Ibid. p. 350. D. [z] Ibid. p. 362. C.
[a] Ibid. p. 63. C. [b] See Vol. iv. ch. lxxxv. [c] Ibid.
[d] In Ps. T. i. p. 496. A. [e] T. iii. p. 268. A.
[f] Vid. in Cant. T. i. p. 1058. A. et 1082. B. In Es. T. ii. p. 93. A. In Ep. ad. Rom. T. iii. p. 81. C. In I. ad Tim. p. 472. A.

of St. Peter; and once, either[g] 2 Pet. ii. 22, or Prov. xxvi. 11.

11. The first epistle of John is thus quoted by him: 'And[h] the divine apostle John, at the beginning of his epistle, says: "That which we have seen, and our hands have handled."' And, in one of the Dialogues on the Incarnation, if it be genuine, the first of St. John is thus quoted: 'Hear[i] the great John, in his catholic epistle, saying.' This epistle is quoted again[k] in the epistle to Sporacius.

12. I do not recollect any quotation of the Revelation, in the unquestioned works of Theodoret. In a passage of[l] Athanasius, inserted in the forementioned Dialogues, the Revelation is cited; but the genuineness of those Dialogues is disputed, as before seen: and, if they were unquestionably genuine, it might not follow, that Theodoret received the book of the Revelation, unless he had himself cited it upon some other occasion. The Revelation is, once or twice,[m] slightly cited, in the fifth volume of Theodoret's works, or the Appendix, published by Garnier; but it is not certainly known that those writings are Theodoret's. It appears to me, therefore, probable, that Theodoret did not receive the book of the Revelation.

13. Here it may not be amiss for the reader to compare Theodoret with Cyril of Alexandria: Cyril, who lived in Egypt, received the Revelation, and quotes the catholic epistles very freely; but Theodoret, who lived in Syria, either rejected the Revelation, or was shy of quoting it, and likewise cites the catholic epistles very seldom.

14. Upon the whole, Theodoret received the four gospels, the Acts, Paul's fourteen epistles, the epistle of James, the first of Peter, and the first of John; but there is no plain proof, that he received the book of the Revelation, or the other four catholic epistles: insomuch, that there is some reason to think, that his canon of the New Testament was the same with that of the Syrian christians.

V. General titles and divisions of the scriptures, used by Theodoret, are such as these: the[n] ancient scripture, and the gospels; gospels,[o] prophets, and apostles: prophets,[p] and apostles; the[q] books of the sacred gospels,

[g] In Dan. T. ii. p. 572. D.
[h] Hær. Fab. l. v. c. 15. T. iv. p. 287.
[i] Vid. Dial. 1. T. iv. p. 29. C.
[k] T. iv. p. 701. C.
[l] Dial. 1. T. iv. p. 39. C.
[m] Vid. Adv. Macedon. Dial. 4. T. v. p. 374. A. et p. 378. A.
[n] In Gen. T. i. p. 31. C. D.
[o] Ep. 109. T. iii. p. 978. C.
[p] Hær. Fab. Compend. T. iv. p. 187.
[q] Ep. 17. T. iii. p. 91. D.

the writings of the holy apostles, and the oracles of the thrice blessed prophets; evangelists,[r] and apostles; prophets; and Moses, the chief of the prophets.

VI. Terms of respect are such as these: the divine scripture; the divine apostle; as says the most excellent Paul; the most wise Paul; oracles of the spirit; the Lord, in the divine gospels; the voice of the sacred gospels; divine oracles; the divine apostle, in the epistle to the Hebrews; the blessed Paul; great Peter [in the Acts;] the[s] most excellent Peter, chief of the apostles; thrice blessed Luke, in the Acts; which[t] the blessed Matthew teaches by the genealogy; the[u] great and excellent Paul, master of the whole world; the[v] most wise Paul, the excellent architect of the churches.

What he asserts, he proves from the[w] scriptures; he likewise recommends the study of the scriptures, and shows the benefit of it. They,[x] he says, who will compare the divine oracles with human writings, may easily discern the superior excellence of the former: so he writes in an argument with heathen people. Writing to a woman, who had buried a hopeful son, he says: 'He[y] sends her some consolatory thoughts, taken partly from reason, partly from scripture; God having given us all manner of consolation by the divine oracles: but he needs not enlarge, because she had been, from her childhood, instructed in the divinely inspired scriptures, and had ordered her conversation by them; and she needed no other instruction. Recollect, then, those words, which teach us to moderate the passions; which promise eternal life; which declare the abolishing of death; which assure us of the general resurrection of all men.'

VII. I shall add some explications of scripture, and some remarkable observations.

1. By the "spirit that moved upon the face of the waters," Gen. i. 2, he thinks to be meant,[z] not the Holy Spirit, but the air, or wind.

2. God,[a] foreseeing how Adam would act, and that he would become mortal by transgression, gave him a suitable nature, and made the sexes.

[r] Gr. Aff. Serm. 4. T. iv. p. 541. B.

[s] Τε θεσπεσιε Πετρε, τε κορυφαιε των αποστολων εν ταις Πραξεσι. T. i. p. 402. D.

[t] T. i. p. 67. B.

[u] Και ὁ μεγας δε της οικεμενης διδασκαλος, ὁ θεσπεσιος Παυλος. Ep. 83. T. iii. p. 958. B.

[v] Παυλος, ὁ πανσοφος, ὁ των εκκλησιων αριστος αρχιτεκτων. Ep. 146. T. iii. p. 1033. D.

[w] De Provid. Or. ix. T. iv. p. 425. A.

[x] Gr. Aff. S. 4. T. iv. p. 541. C.

[y] Ep. 17. T. iii. p. 912. A.

[z] In Gen. T. i. p. 8. D.

[a] Ibid. p. 33. D.

3. The[b] doctrine of the Trinity was not clearly taught the Jews, because of their imperfection. If it had been so revealed, they would have made it an occasion for Polytheism.

4. By "the eye-witnesses and ministers of the word," Luke i. 2, the evangelist[c] does not mean ministers of God the word, but of the doctrine of God the word.

5. Upon Is. ix. 1, he says, that[d] Galilee was the native country of Christ's apostles; and[e] there he wrought many miracles, particularly his first miracle of turning water into wine, as is related by John the divine.

6. Upon Rom. i. 4, Theodoret says, that[f] during his life here on earth, Christ was not reputed to be God, either by the Jews, or by the apostles.

7. Upon 1 Cor. xiii. 7, he says: 'The[g] Spirit is still given to those who are baptized, though not visibly: but then the baptized immediately spake with tongues, and wrought miracles; whereby they were confirmed in the belief of the truth of the doctrine of the gospel: therefore, I think, miracles were not wrought by christians in Theodoret's time.

8. Again, upon 1 Cor. xii. 9, 'Because[h] of the prevailing infidelity, many miracles were then wrought, to convince men of the truth. That miracles of healing were then wrought, giving health to the sick, feet to the lame, and eyes to the blind, is manifest from the history of the Acts.'

9. Theodoret seems to have supposed, that the apostle Paul received the whole doctrine of the gospel immediately from heaven; for, upon Gal. i. 18, he says, 'that[i] Paul had been taught of God, and needed not any human instruction; though he made a visit to Peter, and showed him due respect, as the chief of the apostles.'

VIII. Theodoret admirably represents the success of the doctrine of the gospel, or the progress of the christian religion, especially in his books against the Gentiles: I must transcribe some passages, and refer to others.

1. 'The[k] all-wise Deity committed the culture of a bar-

[b] Ibid. p. 170. C.

[c] Λογον γαρ εντανθα ϗ τον Θεον λογον καλει, αλλα την τϗ Θεϗ λογϗ διδασκαλιαν. In Es. T. ii. p. 13. C.

[d] T. ii. p. 41. C.

[e] Ib. D.

[f] Προ μεν τϗ ϛαυρϗ και τϗ παθους, ὁ δεσποτης Χριϛος ϗ μονον τοις αλλοις Ιϐδαιοις, αλλα και αυτοις αποϛολοις, ϗκ εδοκει ειναι Θεος, κ. λ. T. iii. p. 11. B.

[g] T. iii. p. 179. D.

[h] Δια γαρ την τηνικαυτα κατεχουσαν απιϛιαν, πολλα τοιαυτα εθαυματουργουν εις εκπληξιν, δια τουτων αυτους ποδηγουντες προς την αληθειαν, κ. λ. T. iii. p. 180. B. C.

[i] T. iii. p. 367. D.

[k] Hær. Fab. in Prol. T. iv. p. 190.

ren world to a few men; and those fishermen and publicans, and one tentmaker.'

By this, and other passages, it may be perceived, that Theodoret did not reckon Barnabas an apostle, in the highest meaning of that word.

2. Upon Gen. xlix. 9, 10, 11, he says: The[l] apostles were Jews; and not only they, but the seventy disciples also; and the three thousand, whom the chief of the apostles caught in his net at once; and five thousand; and many myriads of whom the thrice blessed James makes mention to the most excellent Paul. See Acts xxi. 20.

3. He says, that[m] by the holy doctrine of the apostles, God had made the earth a heaven; having converted many, in every nation, from the pursuit of earthly things, and disposed them to embrace a heavenly conversation.

4. From Theodoret's books against the Gentiles it appears, that the heathen people often expressed a contempt of the holy scriptures, because[n] they were not eloquent. Theodoret, therefore, says, he[o] will compare the most celebrated lawgivers of 'the Greeks with our fishermen, and publicans, and tentmakers, and show the difference: for the laws of the former were soon forgotten after the death of those who enacted them; but the laws delivered by fishermen have flourished and prevailed, and have been received, not only by Greeks and Romans, but also by Scythians, Persians, and other barbarians: and, indeed,' says he, 'the[p] doctrine of the divine oracles is worthy of God, and approves itself to the judgment of wise and thoughtful men. There is much more reason to hearken to the apostles and prophets, than to Plato; for in them there is nothing impure, nothing fabulous and incredible; nothing but what is worthy of God; nothing but what is holy and useful: between[q] Moses the lawgiver, and David, and Job, and Isaiah, and Jeremiah, and the whole choir of the prophets; and between Matthew also, and John, and Luke, and Mark, and Peter, and Paul, and the whole college of the apostles, is a full agreement: they all teach the same doctrine; there are no differences among them: and[r] they teach things useful for all, for men and women, and people of every condition; what ought to be done, what should be avoided: which must be approved by all reasonable men; for religion is the concern of all. In-

[l] In Gen. T. i. p. 74. C.
[m] In Es. T. ii. p. 53. A.
[n] Gr. Affect. in Prol. T. iv. p. 461. et ib. Serm. i. p. 465. D.
[o] Ibid. p. 463. B. C.
[p] Ibid. p. 463. C.
[q] Ibid. Serm. v. p. 552. A.
[r] Ibid. p. 553. C. D.

deed,[s] the heralds of truth, the prophets and apostles, were not masters of the Greek eloquence; but, being filled with true wisdom, they have carried the divine doctrine to all nations, Greeks and barbarians; and have filled the whole world, the dry land and the sea, with writings, containing instructions relating to religion and virtue: and now all men, leaving the dreams and speculations of the philosophers, nourish themselves with the doctrine of fishermen and publicans, and study the writings of a tentmaker. The seven wise men of Greece are forgotten; nor[t] do the Greeks themselves exactly know their names: but Matthew, and Bartholomew, and James, yea, and Moses also, and David, and Isaiah, and the other apostles and prophets, all men know, as well as they do, the names of their own children. If you dispute the truth of this, tell me, friends, whom Xenophanes Colophonius left to be his successor; whom Parmenides, or Pythagoras, or Anaxagoras, or Speusippus, or the rest; or what cities follow the laws of Plato's republic? You[u] can show none, who now teach those doctrines: but we can evidently show the power of the prophetical and apostolical doctrines; for the whole earth is filled with their words.

'And the Hebrew writings are translated, not only into Greek, but likewise into the Latin, the Egyptian, the Persian, the Indian, the Armenian, the Scythian, the Samaritan; in a word, into all the languages used by the nations. Our[v] fishermen, and publicans, and tentmaker, have persuaded not only Greeks, and Romans, and Egyptians, but all nations of the earth: nor are our doctrines understood by those only who preside in the churches, but by smiths, and woolcombers, and tailors, and all sorts of artificers; yea, by women, and maid-servants. And not only they who dwell in cities, but country people likewise understand, and are able to discourse of, our doctrines. And moreover, they practise virtue, and shun vicious actions, influenced by the certain expectation of the righteous judgment of God, and the rewards and punishments of another world. Compare[w] then, my friends, the simple doctrine of our fishermen with the pompous titles of the philosophers; and discern the difference. Admire the conciseness of the divine oracles; applaud their power; and acknowledge the truth of the divine doctrines.

'God[x] had before tried other methods: he taught all

[s] Ibid. p. 554. B. C.
[t] Ibid. P. 555. A.
[u] Ibid. p. 555. D.
[v] Ibid. p. 556. A. B. C.
[w] Ibid. p. 558. A.
[x] Ibid. Serm. vi. p. 579. D. 580. A.

men by the wonderful frame of the universe. The Jews he reclaimed by the law and prophets: but a more effectual remedy was wanting; and experience has shown the benefit of it. The whole world has now been enlightened, and idolatry abolished. Greeks, Romans, barbarians, acknowledge a crucified Saviour.

'The[y] divine oracles [or sacred scriptures] are not to be despised, because they abound not in a superfluity of words, but deliver truth in its native beauty and simplicity. It had been easy for the Fountain of wisdom, who has bestowed eloquence even upon bad men, to have made the heralds of truth more eloquent than Plato, acuter than Demosthenes, and more ready at syllogisms than Aristotle and Chrysippus. But his design was not, that five, or ten, or fifteen, or a hundred, or twice so many more should taste the salutary waters; but that all men, Greeks and barbarians, should have the benefit: and not only such as had been taught in schools of rhetoric and philosophy, but shoemakers, and tailors, and smiths, and all sorts of mechanics, and servants, and husbandmen, and, in a word, rich and poor, and men and women of all conditions. For this reason he made use of fishermen, and publicans, and a tentmaker, as instruments; and by them he conveyed to men divine and useful knowledge; not altering the manner of speech to which they had been used, and in which they had been bred, but, nevertheless, pouring out, by their means, the pure and refreshing streams of wisdom. Just as if an entertainer should bring forth to his guests rich and fragrant wine in plain cups and glasses: they who thirst would drink the liquor, and, without regarding the cups, admire the wine. So have men acted in this case.

'How[z] great the power of those illiterate men has been, may appear to those who will compare the Greek and Roman lawgivers with our fishermen and publicans. They will find, that those lawgivers could not persuade even their neighbours to live according to their laws: but these Galileans have persuaded not only Greeks and Romans, but the tribes of the barbarians likewise, to embrace the law and doctrine of the gospel. Our[a] fishermen, and publicans, and tentmaker, have persuaded all men to embrace the laws of the gospel; not only the Romans, and others subject to their empire, but Scythians, and Sarmatians, and Indians, and Ethiopians, and Persians, and Britons, and Germans. Indeed, they have brought all nations, and all

[y] Ibid. Serm. viii. p. 591, 592.
[z] Ibid. Serm. ix. p. 608. B.
[a] Ibid. p. 610.

sorts of men, to receive the laws of a crucified man: and that not by arms, or numerous legions of soldiers, nor by Persian violence; but by reasons and arguments, showing the usefulness of those laws: nor was this effected, without many dangers and difficulties. In many places they suffered injuries; they were beaten, and imprisoned, and tortured, and underwent a variety of sufferings, inflicted on them by those who treated their benefactors, their saviours, and physicians, as their enemies, and as deceitful and designing men; nor[b] have the sufferings brought upon their followers after their death been able to extinguish their doctrine. Romans, as well as barbarians, have done their utmost to abolish it; but they only made it shine out the brighter: and the evangelical laws are still in force. Neither[c] Caius, nor Claudius, have been able to abolish the laws of fishermen, and publicans, and a tentmaker: no, nor yet Nero, their successor; though he put to death two of the principal of those lawgivers, Peter and Paul. He killed the lawgivers, but he could not abolish their laws: nor yet Domitian, or any of the succeeding emperors of Rome. But[d] the more the followers of Jesus, and of his apostles, were persecuted, the more they increased, till the whole world has been filled with them.' Here Theodoret proceeds to instance in a persecution of the christians by the Persians; which he represents as exceeding cruel. He afterwards observes the great alterations which the christian doctrine had made in the manners of those Persians that embraced it; and likewise, how it had civilized other people. 'People[e] whom Augustus, and all the power of the Roman empire, could not induce to receive their laws, venerate the writings of Peter, and Paul, and John, and Matthew, and Luke, and Mark, as if they had been sent down from heaven.'

So writes Theodoret, before the middle of the fifth century. But I am in danger of exceeding in my extracts from so agreeable a writer: I therefore forbear to add any thing farther; though much more follows to the like purpose.

5. One thing we can perceive from Theodoret: that[f] the heathen people were offended at the great respect then

[b] Ibid. p. 610. D.

[c] Των δε ἁλιεων τε και τελωνων, και τȣ σκηνοῤῥαφȣ τȣς νομȣς, ου Γαϊος ισχυσεν, ȣ Κλαυδιος καταλυσαι, κ. λ. Ib. p. 611. D. Vid. et p. 612. A. D.

[d] Ibid. p. 613. B. C.

[e] Ibid. p. 615. A.

[f] Και το γεραιρειν δε τȣς μαρτυρας καταγελαςον εφασκον, και λιαν ανοητον το πειρασθαι τȣς ζωντας παρα των τεθνεωτων ωφελειαν ποριζεσθαι. Græc. Aff. in Prol. T. iv. p. 461.

shown to the martyrs. Theodoret justifies it: he says, the Greeks had little reason to make exceptions of that kind. Nor[g] did christians bring sacrifices to the martyrs; they only honoured them as excellent men, who had faithfully served God, and had laid down their lives for the truth.

6. He[h] likewise insists on the celebrity of the martyrs, as an argument in favour of the principles which they professed. The memory, he says, of many triumphant conquerors is almost lost. Nobody knows where Darius, and Xerxes, and Alexander, were buried; nor can any show the sepulchres of Augustus, and the emperors that have succeeded him. But[i] the tombs of the victorious martyrs are well known, and often frequented; and magnificent temples are built to them, with the materials of heathen temples. And[k] God has brought his dead men, the martyrs, into the room of your deities.

So Theodoret: but the scriptures have given no directions for paying such respect to martyrs. And it should be considered, that by this time error had been mixed with truth; and superstition with religion: nor did the martyrs of the primitive times desire such honours to be given to them; or to be placed in the room of heathen deities. They had protested against all idolatry: and laid down their lives, rather than give religious worship to any but God, and his Christ.

[g] Ibid. Serm. 8. p. 599. C.
[h] Ibid. Serm. 9. p. 604, 605.
[i] Ibid. p. 605. C. D
[k] Ibid. p. 607. A.

CHAP. CXXXII.

JOHN CASSIAN.

I. *His works and time.* II. *His country.* III. *His history.* IV. *In what language he wrote.* V. *Books of the New Testament received by him.* VI. *General titles and divisions of the scriptures, and marks of respect for them.* VII. *Select observations; and this writer's principles and uncharitableness taken notice of: And concerning Nestorius, against whom he wrote.*

I. JOHN CASSIAN,[a] author[b] of Monastic Institutions, in twelve books; Conferences, in number 24; Of the Incarnation of Christ against Nestorius, in seven books, addressed[c] to Leo, then deacon, afterwards bishop of Rome, at whose desire they were composed, reckoned his last work, and written about the year 430; is placed, by Cave, at the year 424, because he computes him to have then begun to write. S. Basnage[d] speaks of him at the year 429, the time of the rise of Semipelagianism in Gaul, of which Cassian is said to be the parent.

II. By Cave[e] he is said to have been of Scythian original, born at Athens. Tillemont says, 'There[f] are difficulties 'about his country; but the most probable opinion is, that 'he was of the Lesser Scythia, a province of Thrace, where 'he might be born about 350, or 360.' Even so ancient a writer as Gennadius,[g] who has placed Cassian in his Catalogue, and given an account of his works, calls him a Scythian: as does[h] Trithemius likewise, very expressly. But Pagi,[i] and[k] other learned men, have cleared up this diffi-

[a] Vid. Cav. H. L. T. i. p. 410. Du Pin, Bib. T. iii. p. 2. Tillem. Mem. T. xiv. [b] De Cœnobiorum Institutis: Collationes Patrum in eremo Scheti, seu Sceti, seu Seiti: De Christi Incarnatione adversus Nestorium. Ap. Bib. PP. T. vii.

[c] Et ad extremum, rogatus a Leone, urbis Romæ episcopo, scripsit adversus Nestorium de Incarnatione Domini libros septem. Gennad. De V. I. cap. 61. Vid. et Cassian. in Pr. libr. de Incarn. Christi.

[d] A. D. 429. n. 4. [e] Joannes Cassianus, genere Scytha, ex Tauricâ Chersoneso oriundus, Athenis natus est. Ubi sup.

[f] Cassien. art. 1. T. xiv. [g] Cassianus, natione Scytha, Constantinopoli a Joanne magno episcopo Diaconus ordinatus, apud Massiliam Presbyter condit duo monasteria, id est, virorum et mulierum. Gennad. De V. I. cap. 61. [h] Johannes Cassianus, natione Scytha, &c. De Scr. Ec. cap. 111. [i] Ann. 404. n. 22—24.

[k] S Basnag. Ann. 429. n. 4.

culty; they argue, from some expressions in his works, that he was a native of what is now called Provence in France. The opinion of his being a Scythian, seems[l] to have arisen from his having been some while in the desert of Scete, or Schetis, or Scitis, in Egypt; and having also written an account of conferences in that country: and learned men, I suppose, do now generally[m] assent to this account. But Du Pin still hesitates. And since him another agreeable writer[n] very lately speaks of him as a 'native of Thrace;' because, perhaps, he had not observed what has been said by Pagi, or the authors referred to by him. Indeed, the other opinion has prevailed very much; and the common title of these Conferences, in the printed editions, is 'Collationes Patrum in Scythicâ Eremo commorantium:' though it is plain, from the work itself, that all those monks or fathers dwelt in Egypt. Moreover, the title of this work in Gennadius, is,[o] Conferences held with Egyptian Monks.

It might have been added, as I apprehend, to other observations relating to this point, that[p] the Greeks were wont to write the name of that desert, Scitis; at least it is so written in Valesius's edition of Socrates: which word might be easily turned into Scythia by some, who were not well acquainted with the geography of Egypt; and they would be carelessly followed by many others. Besides, in[q] the first chapter of the first Conference, and in the title of that chapter, the desert is called Schyti, or Schytis, which cannot denote Scythia. This, if duly attended to, might have induced learned men to think of Scete, or Sciti, or Scitis, in Egypt, where the fathers spoken of certainly dwelt; and then they needed not to have gone to Scythia, in quest of Cassian's native country. I have stayed thus long upon this, because mistakes and inaccuracies are too common; and I think it may be of some use to correct them, when there is a fair opportunity.

III. Cassian entered early into a monastic course of life.

[l] —— 'In eremo Scythiæ, seu in eremo Scythicâ:' si ne ullâ controversiâ scribendum esse 'in eremo Scheti, seu in eremo Scheticâ,' hoc est, ut in versione Græcâ recte legitur, *εν της Σκητεως*. Pagi Ann. 404. n. 22.

[m] Vid. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. vii. p. 551, 552.

[n] Mr. Bower in his Hist. of the Popes, Vol. i. p. 389.

[o] Digessit etiam Collationes cum Patribus Ægyptiis. Genn. ubi supra.

[p] *Και κατα μερος επληρωθη το της Νιτριας ορος, και το της Σκιτεος των μοναχων.* Socr. l. iv. c. 23. p. 232. F.

[q] Caput primum. 'De habitatione Schyti, et proposito Abbatis Möysis.' Cum in eremo Schyti, ubi monachorum probatissimi Patres, et omnium sanctorum morabatur perfectio, &c. Collat. 1.

He was, when young, for some while in a monastery at Bethlehem; afterwards, he and his friend German made a visit to the monks in Egypt. In the year 403, they were at Constantinople, where[r] Cassian was ordained deacon by St. Chrysostom. In 404, or 405, he came to Rome, and was ordained presbyter by Pope Innocent, as it seems. In the year 410, or soon after, as some think, or, as others, several years before, he came into Gaul, and settled at Marseilles, where he erected two monasteries, one for men, another for women. The[s] year of his death is uncertain. However, Cave[t] says, he died in 448, in the 97th year of his age: Basnage,[u] about 450.

IV. It has been questioned, whether Cassian wrote in Greek or Latin. Tillemont says, 'that[v] the Institutions 'and Conferences, which were composed for the sake of 'the monks in Gaul, of which perhaps there were not ten 'who understood Greek, were certainly written in Latin. 'If, therefore, a doubt be admitted concerning any of his 'works, it can only relate to his books of the Incarnation; 'in which, near the end, he addresseth himself to the peo-'ple of Constantinople.' Nevertheless, I think it very plain, that[w] they also were written in Latin.

V. Cassian quotes not only the four gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, and other books of the New Testament, which had been all along universally received by catholic christians; but likewise the[x] epistle to the Hebrews, as Paul's; the[y] epistle of James; the[z] second epistle of Peter; the[a] epistle of Jude; and[b] the Revelation: whence we may conclude, that he received all the same books of the New Testament, which we now receive; which is worthy of observation. Cassian, who had been in Palestine, and Egypt, and at Constantinople, as well as in the western part of the

[r] —— studium tamen discipuli affectumque præsumo. Adoptatus enim a beatissimæ memoriæ Joanne episcopo in ministerium sacrum, atque oblatus Deo. De Incarn. l. vii. c. 31. sub. in.

[s] Pagi Ann. 433. n. 18. See also Tillem. Cassien, art. 14.

[t] Scribere orsus est ab anno 424. Obiit A. 448, ætatis suæ 97. Ubi supra.

[u] Ann. 429. n. 4. [v] Ubi supra. [w] Vid. De Incarn. l. vi. c. 3. [x] Vid. Institu. l. vi. c. 16. De Incarn. Chr. l. v. c. 6. et passim. [y] —— efficiamur secundum apostolum 'non factores, sed judices legis.' [Jac. iv. 11.] Collat. 16. c. 16. Vid. Coll. 5. c. 4. et alibi. [z] Secundum apostoli namque sententiam. 'A quo quisque superatur, ejus servus efficitur.' [2 Pet. 2. 19.] Collat. 7. c. 25. Conf. Inst. l. v. c. 13. [a] Unus quoque apostolorum evidentius dicit: Angelos, qui non servaverunt suum principatum, sed dereliquerunt domicilium suum, &c. [Jud. ver. 6.] Coll. 8. c. 8.

[b] Et in Apocalypsi: 'Ego, quos amo, arguo et castigo.' [Cap. iii. 19.] Col. 6. cap. 11. Vid. et Inst. l. 4. c. 17. l. v. c. 17. Col. 22. c. 7. et alibi.

empire, did not follow the peculiar opinions of any of those places; but he received all those books of the New Testament, which appeared to have been received upon good grounds by any christians.

VI. General titles of books of scripture, and marks of respect for them, are such as these.

In his books against Nestorius he proves what he asserts by[c] divine testimonies; from[d] the prophets and apostles; from the[e] words of prophets, apostles, and evangelists. And he thinks that those testimonies are sufficient to satisfy any man; nevertheless, having endeavoured to prove his doctrine by the authority of scripture, he refers Nestorius[f] to the Creed of the church of Antioch, where he had been educated; and quotes also[g] divers ecclesiastical writers; particularly Hilary, Ambrose, Jerom, Rufinus, Augustine, Athanasius, and [h]John, bishop of Constantinople, or St. Chrysostom.

VII. I shall now select a few other things.

1. He[i] styles John the Baptist, the sacred boundary of the Old and New Testament.

2. He[k] speaks of the evangelist Mark, as the first bishop of the city of Alexandria.

3. The[l] apostle Paul, he calls the master of the whole world.

4. He[m] sometimes compares the Greek and the Latin copies of the New Testament.

[c] Nunc interim et Christum Deum, et Mariam matrem Dei, divinis testibus approbemus. De Inc. Chr. l. ii. c. 2.

[d] Quid ais tu nunc, hæretice? Sufficiuntne hæc testimonia fidei? An aliquid adhuc addendum est? Et quid vel post prophetas, vel post apostolos, addi potest? Ib. l. iii. c. 16. in.

[e] Ergo quia superioribus libris Dominum Jesum Christum non propheticis tantum, atque apostolicis, sed etiam evangelicis atque angelicis testimoniis, cum in carne atque in terrâ esset, Deum probavimus. Ib. l. iv. c. 1. et passim.

[f] Igitur, quia neganti Deum hæretico abunde jam, ut reor, cunctis superioribus scriptis divinorum testimoniorum auctoritate respondimus; nunc ad fidem Antiocheni symboli virtutemque venianus. L. vi. c. 3.

[g] Sed tempus tandem est, finem libro, imo universo operi, imponere, si paucorum tamen sanctorum virorum atque illustrium sacerdotum dicta subdidero; ut id, quod auctoritate testimoniorum sacrorum jam approbavimus, etiam fide præsentis temporis roboremus. Ib. l. vii. c. 24.

[h] Joannes, Constantinopolitanorum antistitum decus. Ibid. c. 30.

[i] De Joanne quoque, qui Veteris Novique Testamenti, velut quidam sacratissimus limes, finis initiumque processit. Inst. l. i. c. 2.

[k] Inst. l. ii. c. 5. [l] Disce ergo primum ab apostolo totius mundi magistro. De Inc. Chr. l. iv. c. 1.

[m] 'Habentes autem alimenta et operimenta, his contenti simus.' [1 Tim. vi. 8.] 'Operimenta' inquiens, non 'vestimenta,' ut in quibusdam Latinis exemplaribus non proprie continetur; id est, quæ corpus operiant tantum, non quæ amictûs gloriâ blandiantur. Inst. l. i. c. 3.

5. In citing the Old Testament, he follows the ancient Latin translation that had been made from the Seventy, and was then in general use. However, once at least,[n] he has quoted Jerom's version as the more exact, or more agreeable to the Hebrew.

6. He[o] quotes the epistle to the Ephesians with that title.

7. Cassian is always reckoned an opposer of the Augustinian doctrine; nevertheless, he was also very averse to Pelagianism, which he describes in this manner: 'He says[p] they do not so much consider Christ to be the Redeemer of mankind, as their teacher, and example, delivering to them precepts of virtue, and setting them an excellent pattern; that obeying him, and following him in the same path of virtue, they may obtain rewards, like those which have been bestowed upon him: thus, he says, setting aside, as far as in them lies, the great design of Christ's coming.'

8. In the year 428, Nestorius was made bishop of Constantinople, who[q] scrupled to call the virgin 'Mary, mother 'of God;' thinking it more proper to call her, 'mother of 'our Lord,' or 'mother of Jesus Christ.' In 430, as before shown, Cassian wrote against him in seven books; and he treats him with great severity. He calls[r] him an apostate,

[n] Dicente Scripturâ:—'Si in sanctis suis non confidit, et in angelis suis reperit pravitatem;' sive, ut emendatior translatio habet: 'Ecce inter sanctos ejus nemo immutabilis, et cœli non sunt mundi in conspectu ejus.' [Job xv. 15.] Coll. 23. c. 8. [o] In epistolâ quoque ad Ephesios de hoc ipso opere ita præcipit, dicens. Inst. l. x. c. 17. Vid. et Coll. 13. c. 14. et alibi. [p] Illud sane unum prætereundum non arbitrannur, quod peculiare ac proprium supradictæ illius hæreseos, quæ ex Pelagiano errore descenderat, fuit.—Quo factum est, ut in majorem quoque ac monstrosiorem insaniam prorumpentes, dicerent, Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum hunc in mundum non ad præstandam humano generi redemptionem, sed ad præbenda bonorum actuum exempla venisse: videlicet, ut disciplinam ejus sequentes homines, dum per eandem viam virtutis incederent, ad eadem virtutum præmia pervenirent; evacuantes, quantum in ipsis fuit, omne sacri adventûs donum, et omnem divinæ redemtionis gratiam, &c. De Inc. Ch. l. i. c. 3.—quæ eruditorem eum fecit humani generis, magis quam redemtorem fuisse; quia non redemtionem vitæ hominibus, sed vivendi dederit exemplum. Ibid. l. vi. c. 14. [q] Dicis itaque, quisquis es ille hæretice, qui Deum ex virgine natum negas, Mariam autem matrem Domini nostri Jesu Christi θεοτοκον, id est, matrem Dei appellari non posse, sed χριστοτοκον, id est, Christi tantum matrem non Dei. Cass. de Incarn. Ch. l. ii. c. 2. [r] ——dic mihi, quæso, si Judæorum quispiam aut Paganorum catholicæ fidei symbolum neget, num audiendum eum existimes esse? Non utique. Quid si id ipsum hæreticus aut apostata? Multo certe minus; quia intolerabilius est veritatem cognitam relinquere, quam incognitam negare. Duos igitur in te videmus, catholicum et apostatam. Quid facis in ecclesiâ catholicâ? catholicorum prævaricator? Cur cœtum populi polluis, qui fidem populi denegâsti? Insuper et consistere in altari, et conscen-

perfidious; a blasphemer, impious, and impudent: and[s] earnestly exhorts the people of Constantinople to separate themselves from him, and have no communion with him, but to shun him as a wolf, or pest, lest they should be devoured or infected by him.

9. And he sets out, at the beginning of that work, with an invective against all who had been called hereties in former and latter times; as low as Apollinarius and Pelagius. Such is the temper of some men; indeed, of very many! They behave as if they were infallible: they are, it seems, exactly right; and if any man differs from them never so little, he is presently a heretic and a blasphemer; impious, impudent, perfidious, and the like.

10. I never intended to insert in this work a history of Nestorius: I now therefore take this opportunity to refer my readers to[t] Socrates, and[u] some other ancient writers; and to[v] Mr. Bower, and other[w] learned moderns; where they who are desirous, may receive information.

dere tribunal, et offerre impudentissimum et perfidissimum os tuum populo Dei ausus! De Inc. l. v. c. 10. vid. et. l. iii. c. 10.—Exi itaque, effuge hinc, si potes, tu quisquis es, qui rabido ore, ac blasphemo spiritu furens, nihil interesse inter Adam et Christum putas. Ib. l. v. c. 9.—Et tu, O impiissime, atque impudentissime, præclaræ urbis contaminator, catholicæ ac sanctæ plebis gravis et exitiosa contagio, stare in ecclesiâ Dei ac loqui audes? L. vii. c. 30.

[s] Unde obsecro ac deprecor omnes vos, qui intra Constantinopolitanæ urbis ambitum siti——ut separetis vos ab illo, ut scriptum est, lupo rapaci, qui devoret Dei populum, sicut cibum panis. Ne tetigeritis, neque gustaveritis quidquam illius, quia sunt omnia ad interitum. Exite de medio ejus, ac separamini, et immundum ne tetigeritis. L. vii. c. 31.

[t] Socr. H. E. l. vii. c. 29, 31, 32. [u] Theodoret. H. F. l. iv. c. 12. Evagr. Schol. H. E. l. i c. 2—7. M. Mercat. P. ii. ex edit. J. Garnier, Par. 1673. Phot. Ep. 1. p. 7, 8. Ep. 35. p. 95. Vincent. Lir. Com. c. 16.

[v] History of the Popes, Vol. i. p. 386—406.

[w] Asseman. Bib. Or. T. i. p. 203, 346, 354, 547. T. iii. P. i. p. 35, 611. et alibi. et T. iii. P. ii. Pagi Ann. 428. n. 11. et alibi. S. Basnag. Ann. 428. n. 8, &c. et in Præfat. ad Annal. p. antepenult. T. i. J. Basnag. H. de l'Eglise, l. x. c. 4. l. xx. c. 2. n. 7, &c. et c. 4. n. 22. et alibi. Cav. H. L. T. i. Du Pin, Bib. des Aut. Ec. T. iii. P. ii. Tillemont, S. Celestin, Pape et St. Cyrille d' Alex. art. 8, 13, 17, &c. Mem. Ec. T. xiv.

CHAP. CXXXIII.

EUTHERIUS, BISHOP OF TYANA.

I. *His time and works.* II. *Books of the New Testament received by him,* III. *An argument against following the most.* IV. *An argument for studying the scriptures.*

I. EUTHERIUS, bishop of Tyana, in Cappadocia, flourished, according to[a] Cave, about the year 431. He was a friend of Nestorius, and pleaded his cause against those who condemned him; especially against Cyril of Alexandria, and his followers.

He wrote in Greek; and his words were translated into Syriac; for they are in Ebedjesu's Catalogue: who,[b] beside others, mentions a Commentary upon the gospel; for which reason Eutherius is placed among commentators by[c] Le Long: but Asseman says, that[d] this Commentary is mentioned no where, except in Ebedjesu. For a farther account of Eutherius and his works, I refer to[e] others.

II. In[f] the title that remains of him, the books of the New Testament are often quoted; particularly, the beginning of St. John's Gospel; the Acts of the Apostles; and the epistle to the Hebrews, as Paul's.

III. Having observed this, I shall transcribe a part of two remarkable arguments.

The[g] first is against those, who judged of principles by the multitude of those who embraced them. 'Christ,'[h] says he, 'is the truth, as he himself said. Him we ought to follow, who said, "Be of good cheer, I have overcome the world." [John xvi. 33.] Are not they then to be pitied, who judge of the truth of a doctrine by the numbers of those who embrace it? Such[i] do not consider, that the Lord

[a] H. L. T. i. p. 419.

[b] Eutherius edidit disputationem adversus Theopaschitas, necnon homilias, variasque interpretationes, et expositionem evangelii. Ebed. Catal. cap. 32. ap. Assem. Bib. Or. T. iii. p. 42.

[c] Bib. Sacr. p. 718.

[d] Ubi supr. p. 42.

[e] Vid. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. vii. p. 446, &c. Du Pin, Bib. T. iii. P. ii. p. 67. Tillem. Mem. T. 14. S. Cyril d'Alex. art. 97. Phot. Cod. 46. Mr. Bower's History of the Popes. Vol. ii. p. 3, 4.

[f] Vid. Eutherii, Tyanor. Episc. Sermones: seu Confutationes quarumdam Propositionum. ap. Theodoret. T. V. p. 688—726. et ap. Athan. T. ii. p. 560—584. edit. Bened.

[g] Προς τους πληθει μονῳ κρινοντας την αληθειαν.

[h] Ap. Theodoret. T. V. p. 690, 691. et Athan. T. ii. p. 561, 562.

[i] Και ου συνιεντες, ὁτιπερ ὁ δεσποτης Χριστος

Christ had twelve disciples, illiterate, poor, unexperienced, whom he encouraged to withstand the whole world: not directing those twelve to follow myriads; but requiring that myriads should learn of them. And in like manner will truth always prevail, though it be at first maintained by a few only.——Let them be ever so many, they shall not persuade me to think, that day is night; nor induce me to take brass money for gold, or manifest poison for wholesome food. In things of this world we do not follow the judgment of the mistaken multitude. Why then should we follow it in heavenly things, which are of much greater moment, without any good reasons assigned; and at the same time abandon doctrines, that have been handed down to us with great consent from ancient times, agreeably to the testimony of the scriptures? Have we not heard the Lord saying, "Many are called, but few chosen." And again: "Strait is the gate, and narrow the way, that leadeth to life: And few there be that find it." [Matth. vii. 13, 14.] Who that is in his senses would not wish to be of the few that enter through the strait gate to salvation, rather than of the many that go in the broad way to destruction? What wise man, if he had lived in the time of the blessed Stephen, who was stoned alone, would not have taken his part, rather than that of the multitude, which judged of truth by numbers? The judgment of one sedate and discreet person, is more valuable than that of ten thousand unthinking people. Many examples in support of this assertion, might be alleged from the Old Testament, as well as from the New.——You, if you think fit, may honour the multitude that was drowned in the flood: give me leave to retire into the ark, and be saved. You, if you think fit, may stay with the people of Sodom: I will travel with Lot, although he goes alone: not but that I too have a respect for the multitude; nevertheless, not when they shun inquiry, but when they produce evidence; not when they are influenced by flattery and bribes, or are misled by ignorance, or are swayed by fear of threatened evils, and prefer the momentary pleasures of sin before eternal life.'

IV. The other argument is against some who discouraged the reading of the scriptures. 'I[k] must, in the next place, confute those who have the assurance to say, that studying the scriptures is needless. If a man believe, it is sufficient; inquiry only makes things more obscure and uncertain.

δωδεκα μαθηταις απλοις, αγραμματοις, πενησιν, ευαλωτοις, το κατα παντος τ8 κοσμ8 θαρσος δεδωρηται, κ. λ. [k] Ap. Theodoret. T. v. p 692, 693. et Athan. T. ii. p. 562, 563.

But, says he, this is the reasoning of men who distrust the merits of their cause. On the other hand, relying upon the truth of our doctrine, and the assistance of him who cannot lie, and has said, "He that seeketh, findeth," [Matth. vii. 8.] we inquire, hoping to know what we are desirous to be acquainted with: we prove what we assert; and hear with attention and candour. In which method we convince our friends, confute our opposers, and satisfy ourselves, that we do not propose false doctrine? Shall I neglect the scriptures? How then shall I attain to knowledge? If I want knowledge, how shall I have faith? Accordingly Paul says, "How shall they believe, if they have not heard?" And again: "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." [Rom. x. 14, 17.] To be ignorant of the Roman laws is safe for no man. How great then is the sin of those who forbid men to learn and meditate upon the important oracles of the King of heaven! The scripture is the food of the soul. Do not then cause the inner man to perish with "a famine, not of bread and water, but of hearing the word of the Lord." [Amos viii. 11.] There are enough to wound the soul; and do you hinder a man from seeking proper medicines? Consider the chamberlain, a true lover of the word, who had the charge of all his queen's treasure. [Acts viii.] Who even, when travelling, ceased not to read. Whose conduct was so approved by the Lord, that he sent one to explain to him what he did not understand; and by the scriptures to lead him to the knowledge of the Saviour. And himself said: "Search the scriptures," [John v. 39.] which implies a diligent and attentive examination of things obscure and difficult. In a word, some endeavour to hinder men from reading the scriptures, with a pretence, that it is prying into things that are inaccessible; but indeed, that they may the better hinder men from showing, by them, the absurdity of their false opinions.'

Du Pin says that,[l] in these passages, the author advances principles that agree very much with those of the pretended reformed: nevertheless he has been so good as to translate them. I presume, therefore, that my doing the like can give offence to none: moreover, these passages have been highly commended by[m] Mr. Bower.

[l] Ibid. p. 67

[m] History of the Popes, Vol. ii. p. 3, 4.

CHAP. CXXXIV.

PROSPER OF AQUITAIN.

1. PROSPER, of Aquitain, by some said to have been a bishop; by others,[a] more probably, reckoned a mere layman, is placed, by[b] Cave, as flourishing about the year 444: Basnage[c] speaks of him at the year 434, which seems to be more proper; for Prosper had some correspondence with Augustine, who died in 430; and, in the year 434, had written several things in favour of the Augustinian doctrine. He is supposed to have lived until after the year 460; but the exact time of his death is not known.

2. I place below[d] the chapter of Gennadius concerning him; who commends Prosper's learning and style, or manner of writing, though he dislikes his doctrine.

3. There are several things ascribed to Prosper, which are not received by all as genuine. I intend, in this chapter, to make extracts out of those works, which are generally allowed of; and, in the following, to take notice of some others, whose genuineness is contested.

4. Prosper quotes not only the gospels, and Acts, and other books of the New Testament, universally received; but likewise[e] the epistle to the Hebrews, the[f] epistle of James, the[g] second of Peter, and[h] the Revelation.

[a] Vid. Pagi Ann. 455. n. 17. 466. n. 4. Basnag. Ann. 434. 13. Fabr. Bib. Lat. T. iii. p. 521, 522. et alios historiæ literariæ scriptores. [b] Hist. Lit. T. i. p. 436. [c] Ann. 434. n. 13. [d] Prosper, homo Aquitanicæ regionis, sermone scholasticus, et assertionibus nervosus, multa composuisse dicitur. Ex quibus ego chronica illius nomine prætitulata legi, continentia a primi hominis conditione, juxta divinârum scripturarum fidem, usque ad obitum Valentiniani Augusti, et captivitatem urbis Romæ a Genserico Vandalorum rege factam. Legi et librum adversus opuscula sub personâ Cassiani, quæ ecclesiæ Dei salutaria probat, ille infamat nociva. Quæ enim vere Cassiani et Prosperi de gratiâ et libero arbitrio sententiæ fuerunt, in aliquibus sibi contraria inveniuntur. Epistolæ quoque Papæ Leonis adversus Eutychen, de verâ Christi incarnatione, ad diversos datæ et ab ipso dictatæ dicuntur. Gennad. de V. I. cap. 84. [e] Et si omnia bona, utique et fidem, sine quâ nemo placere potest, et quæ est virtutum omnium fundamentum. [Hebr. xi. 6.] Pro Augustin. Responsion. ad Exc. Genuen. Exc. 8. ap. Append. Opp. Augustin. Bened. T. x. et alibi. [f] Vid. Ep. ad Rufin. de Grat. et Lib. Arbitrio. cap. 17. et passim. In ead. App.

[g] A quo quis superatus est, ei servus addictus est. [2 Pet. ii. 19.] Lib. contr. Collat. in App. ibid. Nam et verbum propheticum lucernæ comparans apostolus Petrus. ' 'Habemus,' inquit, 'certiorem propheticum sermonem,' &c. [2 Pet. i. 19.] Exp. in Ps. 118. al. 119. ap. Bib. PP. T. viii. p. 139. H.

[h] Et in Apocalypsi est ista vox martyrum. [Apoc. vi. 10.] Expos. Ps. 118.

5. He expressly rejects[i] the book of Hermas, or the Shepherd, as of no authority.

6. He[k] quotes the epistle to the Ephesians, with that title.

7. Prosper has a fine passage concerning good works, which I transcribe[l] in the margin. Some may suspect that his expressions represent them to be of greater value than he intended.

CHAP. CXXXV.

WORKS ASCRIBED TO PROSPER OF AQUITAIN.

I. *Two books of the calling of the Gentiles.* II. *An Epistle to Demetrius.* III. *Of the divine promises and predictions.* IV. *A work entitled, De Vitâ Contemplativâ.*

I SHALL now make some extracts out of those writings which have been ascribed to Prosper; but are not certainly known to be his.

I. One is a work, in two books, entitled,[a] Of the Calling of the Gentiles. Quesnel[b] has a dissertation to show that it is not Prosper's, but Leo's. Anthelmi and[c] Pagi still think it to be Prosper's. Du Pin[d] has carefully considered the arguments on both sides, without determining the question; but somewhat inclining to Quesnel's opinion. Tille-

ibid. p. 138. H. Et habenti dicitur: 'Tene quod habes, ne alius accipiat coronam tuam.' [Apoc. iii. 11.] In Ps. 134. ibid. p. 151. C.

[i] Post illud autem nullius auctoritatis testimonium, quod disputationi suæ de libello pastoris inseruit. Contr. Collat. cap. 13. n. 42. in App. ut supra.

[k] De Ephesiorum etiam fide quid sentiat, audiamus, &c. Contr. Collat. c. 16. n. 50.

[l] Lex Christi perfectio caritatis est, quâ Deus proximusque diligitur, et per quam dicitur conditori legis: 'Dimitte nobis debita nostra, sicut et nos dimittimus debitoribus nostris.' Bene enim exspectat promissionem Dei, qui mandata ejus exsequitur. Nec frustra sperat parcendum peccatis suis, qui ignoscit alienis. Lib. Sentent. n. 37. in App. ubi supra. Et Conf. Expos. Ps. 139. V. 4. ubi supra.

[a] De Vocatione omnium Gentium, Libri duo. Ap Leon. M. Opp. T. i. edit. Quesn. Lugd. 1700.

[b] Diss. 2. ap. Leon. Opp. T. ii.

[c] Vid. Pagi Ann. 444. n. 4. et seq. et 461. n. 13.

[d] Bibl. T. iii. P. ii. p. 193. De l'Auteur des livres de la Vocation des Gentils, et de l'Epître à Démétriade.

mont[e] likewise weighs the reasons on both sides, without declaring for either; and in another place[f] says, he does not think Quesnel's arguments to be conclusive. S. Basnage says, the[g] style of the work plainly shows it not to be Prosper's; but he does not say whose it is. For my part, I think the author may be reckoned unknown and anonymous.

1. This writer had in his copies[h] the latter part of the sixteenth chapter of St. Mark's gospel.

2. He quotes[i] the epistle to the Ephesians, with that title.

3. The[k] epistle to the Hebrews is here quoted several times.

4. He[l] quotes the epistle of St. James.

5. The most remarkable thing in these two books is, that[m] the author quotes the epistles of St. Peter, as written to Gentile christians.

6. He quotes[n] both the epistles of Peter, and the first epistle of John, very often: he also quotes[o] the epistle of Jude, and[p] the book of the Revelation.

II. There is a letter to the Virgin Demetrias, ascribed sometimes to Ambrose of Milan; at other times to Prosper of Aquitain. Quesnel[q] contends, that it was written by the author of the Calling of the Gentiles; who, he says, was Pope Leo. Pagi[r] thinks it was written by Prosper. Cave

[e] S. Prosper. art. 12. Mem. T. xvi. [f] Il semble néanmoins, qu' il y prouve mieux la foiblesse des conjectures des autres, que la solidité des siennes. S. Leon. Pape. art. i. T. xv.

[g] De Vocatione Gentium liber, qui vulgo et Prospero addicitur, ab eo esse abjudicandum, certissime docent stylus ab illo Prosperi diversus, altumque de Augustino silentium. An. 434. n. 14.

[h] Secundum Marcum vero eisdem apostolis ita dicitur: 'Ite in orbem universum. Prædicate evangelium universæ creaturæ, &c. [Marc. xvi. 15, 16.] De Vocat. omn. Gent. l. ii. c. 2. Vid. et c. 3. Ap. Leon. Opp. Lugd. 1700.

[i] Ad Ephesios quoque scribens. l. i. c. 23. Vid. et c. 24. et alibi.

[k] Aut cum ait: 'Novissimis istis diebus locutus est nobis in filio, quem constituit heredem universorum.' [Hebr. i. 2.] l. i. c. 9. Vid. et l. ii. c. 11.

[l] Lib. i. cap. 24. [m] Sicut est quod sanctus Petrus apostolus, scribens sui et futuri temporis gentibus, ait: Vos autem genus electum, regale sacerdotium, gens sancta, &c. [1 Pet. ii. 9, 10.] l. i. c. 11. Vid. et c. 15. [n] Item idem in secundâ epistolâ de fidei perceptione loquitur. 'Simon Petrus, servus et apostolus Jesu Christi, his qui 'coæqualem nobis adepti sunt fidem.' [2 Pet. i. 1.] l. i. c. 23.

[o] Et, ut brevissime pateat, qualis sit natura humana sine gratiâ, dicat Judas apostolus, quid agat vel ignorantia imperitorum, vel doctrina sapientium: 'Hi 'autem,' inquit, 'quæcumque quidem ignorant, blasphemant: quæcumque 'autem naturaliter velut bruta animalia nôrunt, in his corrumpuntur.' [Jud. ver. 10.] L. i. c. 19. [p] Vid. l. ii. c. 11.

[q] Vid. Diss. iv. ap. Opp. S. Leon. T. ii.

[r] Ann. 413. n. 8, 9.

also[s] is willing to allow, that this epistle and the books of the Calling of the Gentiles, were written by Prosper. Du Pin[t] allows, that they were both written by one and the same person; which, indeed, is the general opinion, though all are not agreed who the author is.

Here[u] seems to be a reference to the epistle to the Hebrews. The[v] epistle of James is here quoted, and[w] both the epistles of Peter. I need not say any thing of the first epistle of John, or other generally received books, which are here often quoted.

III. Another work, formerly ascribed to Prosper, but[x] now generally supposed to be written by an African, is entitled,[y] Of Divine Promises and Predictions, in three, or five parts. If the author's name was Prosper, he must not be he of Aquitain, but another of that name, in Africa; and he may be a contemporary writer.

1. Here are many quotations out of almost all the books of scripture; particularly, the epistle to the Hebrews, the epistle of James, both the epistles of Peter, and the Revelation, which is quoted very largely: I need not make any particular references.

2. This author quotes[z] the latter part of the sixteenth chapter of St. Mark's gospel.

3. He quotes the[a] epistle to the Ephesians, with that title.

4. Once,[b] the second epistle of Peter is quoted, as written to the Gentile christians.

[s] Hist. Lit. T. i. p. 436. [t] Ubi supra, note [d], p. 37.

[u] Aut quod vir sacratissimus Melchisedec, Domini et Salvatoris nostri præferens formam, non fuerit perfecte humilis, quia et sacerdotio eminebat et regno. [Heb. vii. 3.] Ep. ad Demetr. cap. v. p. 41. Ap. S. Leon. Opp.

[v] Vid. ib. cap. 9. p. 43. et c. 24. p. 48.

[w] Sed contra hoc periculum quid beatus Petrus in primâ epistolâ prædicet, audiamus. Item in epistolâ secundâ. Ib. c. 16. p. 46.

[x] Vid. Cav. in S. Prospero. H. L. T. i. p. 436. Pagi Ann. 444. 3. Basnag. Ann. 434. n. 14. Du Pin, S. Prosper. T. iii. P. ii. p. 189. Tillem. S. Prosper, art. 12. T. xvi.

[y] De Promissionibus et Prædictionibus Dei. Part. iii. Quibus adjunguntur dimidium temporis, ad cujus finem implendæ sunt visiones, de Antichristo, et de gloriâ regnoque sanctorum. Ap. Bib. PP. T. viii. p. 1—52. et ap. Prosperi Opera, p. 1—50. Paris. 1671.

[z] Firmant hæc evangelistæ, dicente ipso in Marco: 'Signa autem credentes 'hæc subsequentur. In nomine meo dæmonia ejicient; linguis loquentur 'novis.' [Marc. xvi. 17.] De Promiss. et Prædict. Part 3. Prom. 31. Vid. et cap. 30. ubi citatur ver. 14. [a] Exponens quippe hunc locum in epistolâ ad Ephesios, ait. Ibid. P. i. c. 1. Vid. ib. c. 7.

[b] Testatur et Petrus apostolus in epistolâ ad Gentes. 'Deus enim,' ait, 'angelis peccantibus non pepercit.' [2 Pet. ii. 4.] Dimid. Temp. c. 2.

5. He twice quotes[c] 1 John iii. 16, in this manner: 'Because as Christ laid down his life for us, we also ought to lay down our lives for the brethren.' I mention this, because of our English translation of the former part of this verse, which is unsupported by any good authority: "Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us:" so our translation. However, I presume, it needs not to be supposed, that this author had the name of Christ in this verse. No: probably he read, as in most, or even all Greek copies: 'Hereby perceive we the love [which ought to be in us] because he [meaning Christ, or the Son of God, the antecedent, mentioned ver. 8,] laid down his life for us; and [or so] we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren.'

6. This writer quotes[d] the fifth chapter of St. John's first epistle, without the heavenly witnesses.

IV. There is still another work, [e] De Vitâ Contemplativâ, in three books, which was formerly ascribed to Prosper, and[f] is now generally thought not to be his; but rather a work of Julian Pomerius, supposed to have been presbyter at the city of Arles, in Gaul, about the year 498.

1. This work does not abound with texts of scripture; though the Acts of the Apostles are here several times largely quoted, and also the epistle of James.

2. This writer makes a lamentable complaint of the clergy of his time: That[g] they sought riches, honour, power, and authority; but neglected the duties of their function, and the care of the people which had been committed to their charge.

[c] Testatur et Joannes apostolus, dicens: Sicut Christus pro nobis animam suam posuit, sic et nos debemus pro fratribus animas ponere. De Prom. P. 3. c. 34. Vid. et Part 2. c. 38. [d] Dicit et Joannes apostolus: 'Tria sunt, quæ testimonium dicunt: Spiritus, sanguis, et aqua.' Et sequitur: 'Si testimonium hominum acceperimus, testimonium Dei majus est.' Prom. P. 3. c. 25. [e] De Vitâ Contemplativâ, libri tres. Ap. Bib. PP. T. viii. p. 52—83. et ap. S. Prosperi Opp. p. 51—83. Paris. 1671.

[f] Vid. Cav. H. L. P. 1. De Prospero, p. 436. de Jul. Pomerio, p. 466. Du Pin, Bib. T. ii. P. 2. S. Prosper. p. 189. et Jul. Pomere, ib. p. 273, &c. Tillem. S. Prosper, art. 12. T. xvi. [g] Sed nos præsentibus delectati, dum in hac vitâ commoda nostra et honores inquirimus: non ut meliores, sed ut ditiores, nec ut sanctiores, sed ut honoratiores simus cæteris, festinamus. Nec gregem Domini, qui nobis pascendus, tuendusque commissus est, sed nostras voluptates, dominationem, divitias, et cetera blandimenta, carnaliter cogitamus. Pastores dici volumus, nec tamen esse contendimus. Officii nostri vitamus laborem, appetimus dignitatem. De Vit. Contempl. l. i. c. 21. in.

CHAP. CXXXVI.

VINCENTIUS LIRINENSIS.

I. *His work, called a Memoir or Commonitorium, and his time.* II. III. *The first and second chapters of that work.* IV. *Remarks upon those two chapters.* V. *The third chapter of that Memoir.* VI. *The meaning of it examined and settled.* VII. *Remarks upon it.* VIII. *Books of the New Testament received by him.* IX. *Select passages.* X. *Remarks upon one of those passages, for showing the authority of scripture, as the rule of faith.*

I. VINCENTIUS LIRINENSIS,[a] or VINCENT, monk and presbyter in the monastery of Lerins, an island on the south coast of France, wrote a Memoir, or[b] Commonitorium for the Catholic Faith, against the profane novelties of all heretics, as it is now entitled. It was written in the year of our Lord 434, as we learn from himself, who speaks of its being then three years since the council of Ephesus, which was held in 431. The work, as first composed by him, consisted of two books; but the second book having been lost by some accident, he contented himself with making a recapitulation of the whole: which we still have, together with the first book. It may be also observed that, for some reasons, he did not put his name to his work; but published it under the borrowed name of Peregrinus, or, The Pilgrim against Heretics. As most of these particulars are mentioned by Gennadius, in his book of Illustrious Men, I have transcribed the chapter below. It is supposed that Vincent died about the year 450.

Vincent is generally called a Semi-Pelagian, and reckoned

[a] Vid. Cav. H. L. P. i. Pagi Ann. 434. n. 15—20. S. Basnag. Ann. 434. n. 10—12. J. Basnag. Hist. de l'Eglise, l. 9. ch. 7. n. 4. Du Pin, Bib. T. iii. P. 2. p. 170. Tillem. Mem. T. xv.

[b] Vincentius, natione Gallus, apud monasterium Lirinensis insulæ presbyter, vir in scripturis sanctis doctus, et notitiâ ecclesiasticorum dogmatum sufficienter instructus, composuit ad evitanda hæreticorum collegia nitido satis et aperto sermone validissimam disputationem, quam, absconso nomine suo, titulavit 'Peregrini adversus hæreticos.' Cujus operis, quia secundi libri maximam in schedulis partem a quibusdam furatam perdidit, recapitulato ejus paucis sermonibus sensu pristino compegit, et uno in libro edidit. Moritur, Theodosio et Valentiniano regnantibus. Gennad. c. 64.

an adversary of the Augustinian doctrine; nevertheless, as he is severe against all heresy in general, so[c] particularly against Pelagianism.

II. After the preface, he says: 'Having,[d] with much care and diligence, inquired of great numbers of learned and pious men, for a sure and general rule, whereby to discern the true catholic doctrine from the errors of heretics, I received from almost all this answer: That he who would escape the deceits and snares of heretics, and be preserved sound and entire in the right faith, should secure himself by this twofold method; first, by the authority of the divine law, and then by the tradition of the catholic church.'

III. That is the first chapter. The second is to this purpose: 'But[e] here, perhaps, some may ask; since the canon of scripture is perfect, and abundantly sufficient, what need can there be to join with it the authority of the church's interpretation? The reason is this: Such is the sublimity of the sacred scripture, that all do not understand it alike; but there are many very different interpretations of it: Novatus understands it in one sense: Donatus, in another; Sabellius, in another: and, in the like manner, Arius, Photinus, Priscillian, Pelagius, Nestorius: insomuch, that there are almost as many opinions formed upon it, as there are men in the world. It is therefore necessary, upon account of those numerous and various deviations of error, that the line of the prophetical and apostolical interpretation, should be guided according to the rule of the ecclesiastical and catholic sense.

[c] Et contra reclamant ranæ quædam, et ciniphes, et muscæ morituræ, quales sunt Pelagiani. Comm. cap. 14. Vid. et cap. 40.

[d] Sæpe igitur magno studio et summâ attentione perquirens a quamplurimis sanctitate et doctrinâ præstantibus viris, quonam modo possim certâ quâdam, et quasi generali, ac regulari viâ catholicæ fidei veritatem ab hereticæ pravitatis falsitate discernere, hujusmodi semper responsum ab omnibus fere retuli: quod, sive ego, sive quis alius vellet exsurgentium hæreticorum fraudes deprehendere, laqueosque vitare, et in fide sanâ sanus atque integer permanere, duplici modo munire fidem suam, Domino adjuvante, debere: primum scilicet divinæ legis auctoritate, tum deinde ecclesiæ catholicæ traditione. Comm. cap. 1.

[e] Hic forsitan requirat aliquis: Cum sit perfectus scripturæ canon, sibique ad omnia satis superque sufficiat; quid opus est, ut ei ecclesiasticæ intelligentiæ jungatur auctoritas? Quia videlicet scripturam sacram, pro ipsâ suâ altitudine, non uno eodemque sensu universi accipiunt, sed ejusdem eloquia aliter alius atque alius interpretatur, ut pene quot homines sunt, tot illinc sententiæ erui posse videantur. Aliter namque illam Novatianus, aliter Sabellius, aliter Donatus exponit, aliter Arius,—aliter Photinus, Apollinaris, Priscillianus,—Pelagius, aliter postremo Nestorius. Atqui idcirco multum necesse est, propter tantos tam varii erroris anfractus, ut propheticæ et apostolicæ interpretationis linea secundum ecclesiastici et catholici sensûs normam dirigatur. Ib. c. 2.

IV. We cannot avoid making remarks upon these two chapters.

1. Vincent says, that having inquired of many, how he might discern the catholic doctrine from heresy, he received from almost all of them this answer: 'That it might be done in a twofold method; by the authority of the divine law, and the tradition of the catholic church.' We must not charge Vincent with falsehood; or deny, that he had received this answer from some, and even from many: nevertheless, I cannot say that this direction has appeared in any of the writers whom we have hitherto examined. They do all in general say, that the scriptures of the Old and New Testament are the rule of the christian belief and practice; that there are no other writings from which any doctrine of religion may be proved; that they build their faith upon the prophets and apostles, who alone are infallible; and that they are far from paying the like regard to Cyprian, or Hilary, or their writings. This has been the concurrent declaration of the primitive christians, and of all other christian writers to this time: and we perceive that Vincent had met with some who were of the same opinion; though, as he says, many were for joining ecclesiastical tradition with the divine law.

2. Here is mentioned, by Vincent, that allowed maxim, admitted by all christians in general, that 'the canon of scripture is perfect, and in itself abundantly sufficient for all the purposes of a rule;' and, I think, this must have been a general maxim in Vincent's age, as well as in former times.

3. There is no good reason to say, that 'the scriptures are too sublime to be understood.' It is certain, and has been generally allowed by all christians of the early ages, that the scriptures are clear in all matters of importance; and that, if read with care, and an honest mind, men of ordinary capacities may gain from thence instruction in all things necessary to be known and understood by them, in order to their being saved.

4. The sacred scripture is the only proper rule of christian belief and practice; because it is admitted, by christians of all sects and denominations, to contain a true and infallible account of the revealed will of God. To this all appeal: Sabellians, Novatians, Donatists, Arians, Priscillianists, as well as catholics; by this they are willing to be determined. But how can men of different sentiments be convinced and satisfied by catholic tradition, when they do not admit its authority?

5. To say that the scripture is a 'perfect and sufficient rule,' and that 'tradition must be joined with it,' in order to our knowing the right faith, is a contradiction in terms; though some, as it seems, do not perceive it, through prejudice, or want of due attention.

6. To make tradition the rule of interpretation, is to advance it above the scriptures, and to render them of no effect: which, certainly, could not be the design of any of the numerous christian writers whom we have hitherto consulted; for they do all express a very high regard for the sacred scriptures, and sincerely, so far as we are able to judge.

V. We now proceed to the third chapter of Vincent's Memoir.

'And,[f] in the catholic church itself, great care must be taken, that we hold that which has been believed every where, always, and by all; for that is catholic, as the word itself shows. We are, therefore, to confess that one true faith, which the whole church confesseth, throughout the whole world; nor are we to depart from that faith, which our ancestors and holy fathers have maintained. We are also to follow the determinations which have been made by all, or almost all, the bishops, and eminent men of the church; so shall we obtain universality, antiquity, and consent.'

VI. Upon this chapter, likewise, we are led to make remarks; but before we do so, some inquiries are needful for settling this rule.

First of all. Are the apostles here included, or excluded? 'If,' [g] says Ja. Basnage, 'in order to our receiving any 'thing as true, it ought to have been believed by all teach-'ers, and in all times, we must place the apostles in the 'rank of teachers; for why should they be excluded? Are 'not they as venerable, and as judicious, as the bishops that 'have succeeded them; the greatest honour of some of whom 'is, that they had conversed with the apostles? If we in-

[f] In ipsâ item catholicâ ecclesiâ, magnopere curandum est, ut id teneamus, quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est. Hoc est enim vere proprieque catholicum, (quod ipsa vis nominis ratioque declarat,) quod omnia fere universaliter comprehendit. Sed hoc ita demum fiet, si sequamur universitatem, antiquitatem, consensionem. Sequemur autem universitatem hoc modo, si hanc unam fidem veram esse fateamur, quam tota per orbem terrarum confitetur ecclesia. Antiquitatem vero ita, si ab iis sensibus nullâtenus recedamus, quos sanctos majores ac patres nostros celebrâsse manifestum est. Consensionem quoque itidem, si in ipsâ vetustate omnium, vel certe pene omnium, sacerdotum et magistrorum definitiones sententiasque sectemur. Ibid. c. 3.

[g] Histoire de l'Eglise, l. 9. c. 7. n. 4.

'clude the apostles in the class of teachers, we must have 'recourse to their writings, and consult them; if they are 'excluded, Vincent's rule is badly expressed: for in that 'way we must at once, and first of all, retrench a quarter 'part of the time that had passed between Jesus Christ and 'himself; that is, the first age, and the purest period of the 'church. We also, in this way, set aside those teachers 'which are most to be relied upon, and have had the greatest 'authority.'

So that learned and diligent author. Nevertheless, it seems to me, that the inspired writers of the Old and New Testament are here excluded; for, at the conclusion of the preceding chapter, he said, It is necessary, 'that the 'line of prophetical and apostolical interpretation should 'be guided by the rule of the ecclesiastical and catholic 'sense.' That 'rule,' or 'norma,' is here distinctly specified. The prophets and apostles, therefore, are excluded. Vincent here speaks of quite other persons: he mentions, not them, but only 'bishops, and masters,' or eminent men. I think, he intends the immediate successors of the apostles; and also all succeeding catholics, all in every part of the world to his own time, but especially bishops, and other eminent men.

In the second place. Another question may be put: Whether Vincent speaks of catholics only, or of all christians in general, catholics and heretics, since the time of the apostles? Then the rule will be thus: 'Whatever has been believed every where, always, and by all, with one consent, may be depended upon as certainly the right faith.' This might be reckoned a true, or very probable proposition; for there are some generals, not denied or contradicted by heretics, in which they and catholics agree; but these would make out but a short and defective creed. Moreover, this cannot be Vincent's meaning: for he is laying down a rule to distinguish those catholic doctrines which are different from those of the heretics; not those in which catholics and heretics agree. We must not consider this observation concerning universality, antiquity, and consent, as an independent proposition, but as in connexion with what precedes and follows; which is the only way to know a writer's meaning.

VII. If we have rightly explained this passage, we may now make some remarks.

1. This way of arguing is a plain 'petitio principii,' a mean begging the question: that is assumed, which ought to be proved; it is determined, who are catholics, or which

is the catholic faith; whilst we are still inquiring, What is the catholic faith? which is absurd and ridiculous.

2. This rule is attended with unavoidable and insuperable perplexity and difficulty. It is impossible, or next to impossible, for the most learned and laborious men, much more for private and unlearned christians, to know what opinions are now held by the whole church all over the earth, and have been held by the whole church from the beginning to their own time; and all the declarations and decisions of all bishops and teachers, called catholic.

3. The difficulty is increased by length of time. It is more difficult for us now, than it was for Vincent, to know what has been believed in the church, everywhere, always, and by all.

There is, indeed, one way to shorten this inquiry: which is, for some one man, or a few men, to declare decisively, and authoritatively, what is tradition; or what has been the judgment of all catholics, in all times, and in all places. Then the trouble here spoken of, is saved, but this destroys all private judgment: thought, and examination, and consideration, are no longer needful, but quite useless and insignificant. But before any man can willingly and deliberately allow, that the right faith, or what he is to believe, should be so determined for him, he must be first quite indifferent about truth. He might as well conceit, that what is right or wrong, true or false, should be determined by the throw of a die.

4. The only sure method, therefore, of knowing what is the true christian doctrine, is to have recourse to the scriptures; and, according to our Lord's direction, to "search" them carefully and sincerely, without prejudice: which likewise is the doctrine of all the many christian writers of former times; as appear from the large extracts, which we have made from their works. And as Vincent is pleased to refer us to them, I hope we may be permitted to respect their judgments upon this head, in which there is a very general concurrence among them.

The learned writer, before quoted, says: 'It[h] is wonder-'ful, that so many Protestants, as well as Romanists, should 'have suffered themselves to be dazzled by this rule:

[h] Enfin non seulement les Catholiques Romains, intéressés à défendre les traditions, la mettent toujours à la tête de leurs écrits; mais il y a des Réformés, qui s' en étant laissés éblouir, s' en sont fait une règle sûre pour connôitre la vérité. Mais il est étonnant, qu' on se laisse éblouir par de grands mots, qui ne disent rien, ou qui réduissent l' homme à un examen absolument impossibile. I. Basn. H. de l' Eglise. l. ix. ch. 7. iv.

'which either contains big words only, without meaning, or 'else would reduce a man to an examen absolutely impos- 'sible.'

It is farther observed, by the same writer, that this rule was invented in favour of Semipelagianism. 'The[i] Semi- 'pelagians,' he says, 'embarrassed with the numerous pas- 'sages which Augustine alleged from St. Paul's epistles, 'had recourse to tradition. They accused Augustine of 'being an innovator; they boasted of the antiquity of their 'doctrine. This argument seemed to them so cogent, that 'perhaps there is not any one of their works, in which it is 'not repeated.' Pagi[k] also speaks to the like purpose: though, upon other accounts, he greatly commends this work of Vincent.

Whatever might be the particular views of Vincent, I think that the divinely-inspired scriptures are the sole rule of christian belief and practice; and not the writings, or sentiments of any men, since the days of the inspired apostles of Jesus Christ.

VIII. After this discussion of the first three chapters of Vincent, it may not be amiss to observe, briefly, the books of the New Testament, received or quoted by him.

1. I do not recollect in him any quotation of the epistle of the Hebrews, or reference to it; which may create a suspicion, whether it was received by him.

Otherwise I should be apt to think that he received all the books of the New Testament which we now receive: for he has quoted the second epistle[l] of St. John; and the book of the Revelation is quoted or referred to in a passage of St. Ambrose, quoted[m] by him. It seems also to be referred to in some words of his[n] own.

[i] Ibid.

[k] Opus illud aureum, et nunquam satis pro dignitate ejus commendandum, eo fine conscriptum fuit, ut Augustini doctrinam in suspicionem traheret. Ann. 434. n. 17.—Denique Prosper etiam ad Augustinum scribens eum certiorem facit, Semipelagianos sua dogmata venerando vetustatis nomine tueri, et ei novitatem objicere. 'Obstinationem suam,' inquit, 'vetustate defendunt.' At Vincentius Lirinensis in toto passim Commonitorio id unum inculcat, tuendam antiquitatem, vitandam novitatem: a doctore ea esse dicenda, quæ ab antiquis didicerit. Ibid. n. 18.

[l] 'Siquis,' inquit, 'venit ad vos, et hanc doctrinam non adfert.'—Quid tum? 'Nolite, inquit, 'recipere eum in domum, nec 'Ave,' ei dixeritis. Qui enim dicit illi 'Ave,' 'communicat operibus ejus malignis.' [2 Jo. 10, 11.] Commonit. cap. 33. p. 354. edit. Baluz. 1669.

[m] Vid. Comm. cap. 7. p. 320, 321. Baluz.

[n] Magnum hoc igitur eorundem beatorum exemplum, planeque divinum, et veris quibusque catholicis indefessâ meditatione recollendum, qui in modum septemplicis candelabri septenâ sancti Spiritûs luce radiantes, clarissimam posteris normam præmonstrârunt, &c. Com. cap 7. p. 320. Baluz.

IX. I shall now take some select passages.

1. Vincent describes[o] the cruelty of some Arian persecution; either in the reign of Constantius, or Valens.

2. Vincent assures us that heretics received the same scriptures that were received by catholics.

'Here,[p] perhaps, some one may say: Do heretics then

[o] — disturbati clerici, verberati Levitæ, acti in exilium sacerdotes, oppleta sanctis ergastula, carceres, metalla; quorum pars maxima, interdictis urbibus, protrusi atque extorres, inter deserta, speluncas, feras, saxa, nudidate, fame, siti affecti, contriti, et tabefacti sunt. Comm. cap. 7. p. 320. Baluz.

[p] Hic fortasse aliquis interroget, an et hæretici divinæ scripturæ testimoniis utantur? Utuntur plane, et vehementer quidem. Nam videas eos volare per singula quæque sanctæ legis volumina, per Möysis, per Regum libros, per Psalmos, per apostolos, per evangelia, per prophetas. Sive enim apud suos, sive alienos, sive privatim, sive publice, sive sermonibus, sive in libris, sive in conviviis, sive in plateis, nihil unquam pene de suo proferunt, quod non etiam scripturæ verbis adumbrare conentur. Lege Pauli Samosateni opuscula, Priscilliani, Eunomii, Joviniani, reliquarumque pestium: cernas infinitam exemplorum congeriem; prope nullam omitti paginam, quæ non Novi aut Veteris Testamenti sententiis fucata et colorata sit. Sed tanto magis cavendi et pertimescendi sunt, quanto occultius sub divinæ legis umbraculis latitant. Inde denique et Salvator clamabat: 'Attendite vobis a pseudoprophetis, qui 'veniunt ad vos in vestitu ovium, intus autem sunt lupi voraces.' Quid est vestitus ovium, nisi prophetarum et apostolorum proloquia? Qui sunt lupi rapaces, nisi sensus hæreticorum feri et rabidi? qui manente luporum ferociâ deponunt lupinam speciem, et sese divinæ legis sententiis, velut quibusdam velleribus, obvolvunt; ut, quum quisque lanarum mollitiem præsenserit, nequâquam aculeos dentium pertimescat. Cap. 36. p. 357. Baluz.——Ergo, secundum apostoli Pauli magisterium, quotiescumque vel pseudoapostoli, vel pseudoprophetæ, vel pseudodoctores divinæ legis sententias proferunt, quibus male interpretatis errores suos adstruere conentur, non dubium est, quin auctoris sui callida machinamenta sectentur, quæ ille nunquam profecto comminisceretur, nisi sciret omnino nullam esse ad fallendum faciliorem viam, quam ut ubi nefarii erroris subinducitur fraudulentia, ibi divinorum verborum prætendatur auctoritas. Sed dicet aliquis: Unde probatur, quia sacræ legis exemplis diabolus uti soleat? Legat evangelia, in quibus scribitur: 'Tunc assumsit il-'lum diabolus,' id est, Dominum Salvatorem, et 'statuit illum super pinnam 'templi.' Quid hic faciet misellis hominibus, qui ipsum Dominum majestatis scripturarum testimoniis appetivit? 'Si,' inquit, 'filius Dei es, mitte te deor-'sum.' Quâre? 'Scriptum est enim,' inquit. Magnopere nobis doctrina loci istius attendenda atque retinenda est; ut tanto evangelicæ auctoritatis exemplo, quando aliquos apostolica seu prophetica verba proferre contra catholicam fidem viderimus, diabolum per eos loqui minime dubitemus. Nam sicut tunc caput capiti, ita nunc quoque membra membris, loquuntur, membra scilicet diaboli membris Christi, perfidi fidelibus, sacrilegi religiosis, hæretici postremo catholicis. Sed quid tandem dicunt? 'Si,' inquit, 'filius Dei es, mitte te 'deorsum.' Hoc est: si filius esse vis Dei, et hæreditatem regni cœlestis accipere, mitte te deorsum, id est, ex istius te sublimis ecclesiæ, quæ etiam templum Dei putatur, doctrinâ et traditione demitte. Ac si quis interroget quempiam hæreticorum sibi talia persuadentem: Unde probas? unde doces, quod ecclesiæ catholicæ universalem et antiquam fidem dimittere debeam? statim ille: 'Scriptum est enim.' Et continuo mille testimonia, mille exempla, mille auctoritates parat, de Lege, de Psalmis, de apostolis, de prophetis; quibus novo et malo more interpretatis, ex arce catholicâ in hæreseos barathrum infelix

quote the divine scripture? Yes, very much. They have the phrases in scripture continually in their mouths: they quote every part of scripture: the law; the books of the Kings; the Psalms; the apostles; the gospels; the prophets. They are perpetually citing scripture; and they clothe all their language in expressions of scripture; in public and private; in their sermons, and in their books; at their entertainments, and in their walks. Look into the writings of Paul of Samosata, Priscillian, Eunomius, Jovinian, and other men of that sort: you will scarcely see a page which is not larded with passages of scripture. They say nothing for which they have not a text of scripture, if you will take it in their sense: for which reason they are to be the more dreaded, and guarded against with the utmost care. And our Saviour therefore says: "Beware of false prophets, who come to you in sheeps'-clothing: but inwardly they are ravening wolves." What is the sheeps'-clothing, but the sayings of the prophets and apostles? Who are ravenous wolves, but heretics? Retaining their wolfish fierceness, they cover themselves with sayings of the scriptures, as with fleeces; that they may appear to have the softness of wool, and men may forget their sharp teeth.'

Vincent afterwards alleges, 2 Cor. xi. 13, 14. 'Whence,' he says, 'we may conclude that, according to the apostle, as often as false apostles, false prophets, and false teachers, quote passages of scripture by which, not rightly understood, they endeavour to support their errors, they follow the cunning wiles of their master; which he would never have made use of, if he did not know that there is not a more effectual way to promote error, than a pretence of authority from scripture. But some one may say: How does it appear that the devil is wont to argue from scripture? Let him read the gospels, in which it is written: "Then the devil taketh him, and setteth him upon a pinnacle of the temple. And saith unto him, If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down: for it is written, He shall give his angels charge concerning thee." [Matt. iv. 5, 6.] What

anima præcipitetur. Cap. 37. Baluz. p. 358, 359. Sed dicit aliquis: si divinis eloquiis, sententiis, promissionibus, et diabolus et discipuli ejus utuntur, quorum alii sunt pseudoapostoli, alii pseudoprophetæ, pseudomagistri, et omnes ex toto hæretici, quid facient catholici homines et matris ecclesiæ filii? Quonam modo in scripturis sanctis veritatem a falsitate discernent? Hoc scilicet magnopere curabunt, quod in principio Commonitorii istius sanctos et doctos viros nobis tradidisse scripsimus: ut divinum canonem secundum universalis ecclesiæ traditiones, et juxta catholici dogmatis regulas interpretentur: in quâ item catholicâ et apostolicâ ecclesiâ sequantur necesse est universitatem, antiquitatem, consensionem. Cap. 38. Baluz. p. 360.

will not he do to poor mortals, who attacked the Lord of all with passages of scripture? "If," says he, "thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down." Why? "For it is written," says he. The doctrine of this place ought to be carefully attended to, and well remembered by us: that by this instance, recorded in the gospel itself, we may be fully satisfied, when we see any men alleging passages of the apostles or prophets against the catholic faith, that it is the devil who speaks by them. For as the head then spake to the head, so now the members speak to the members; that is, the members of Satan to the members of Christ: perfidious men to faithful; sacrilegious to religious; in a word, heretics to catholics. But what do they say? "If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down." Which is to say: If thou wilt be the Son of God, and obtain the inheritance of the heavenly kingdom, cast thyself down from the doctrine and tradition of that high church, which is also reckoned the temple of God. And if you should ask any of these heretics, Who talks to you at this rate? How do you prove, that I ought to let go the universal and ancient faith of the catholic church? he will presently answer: "For it is written." And without delay he is ready to allege a thousand passages, a thousand instances, a thousand authorities, from the law, the Psalms, the apostles, the prophets, by which, with his new and false interpretations, the unhappy soul, if not upon the guard, is thrown down from the catholic fortress into the dungeon of heresy.

'But some one may say: If the devil and his disciples, of which some are false apostles, others false prophets, others false teachers, even all heretics, make use of passages and promises of the divine oracles, what shall catholic men do, who are sons of our mother, the church? How shall they understand the scripture, so as to distinguish truth from falsehood? My answer is, that they should carefully observe what was mentioned at the beginning of this Memoir, as delivered to us by learned and holy men: that they are to interpret the divine canon according to the traditions of the universal church, and the determinations of catholic doctrine; in which catholic and apostolic church they must, by all means, have universality, antiquity, consent.'

X. I shall transcribe no more: I only hope that my readers will now join with me in the following remarks:

1. We may hence conclude it to be very probable, that there were then some christians, of different sentiments from Vincentius upon some points, who made great use of scripture, and had an advantage from it: it was their strong

hold; and Vincentius endeavours to bring their intrenchments into suspicion. If he can once draw them from thence, he hopes to have them for his converts and captives.

2. We may also reckon it to be probable, that there were about this time some christians, whose great regard for the determination of some councils, and for the writings of learned men much esteemed by them, had diminished their respect for the sacred scriptures.

3. Nevertheless, in the method here proposed, of joining the traditions of the church with scripture, or interpreting the divine canon by the determinations of bishops, and other eminent men, Vincentius is far from having universality, antiquity, consent; many excellent christians, of his own time, had a greater regard for scripture. The early christian writers declare the inspired scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be the rule of faith; and in that doctrine they concur, and consent. [q] And I would hope that the large collections which have been made by us, containing so numerous testimonies to the scriptures, may be of use to fortify serious men against all confident assertions to the contrary: for whenever they are advanced, they must be accompanied with confidence, as the only way of making head against reason, scripture, and the general sense of the most early christians.

Vincentius does little less than say, that arguments from scripture are heretical and satanical: which, I presume, every reader of this work is able to say, upon good grounds, is a novel way of speaking, unknown in the early ages of christianity, next succeeding those of the apostles; in which the scriptures were not slighted and disparaged, but highly respected, and earnestly recommended to the attention of all. Moreover, Vincentius seems to have forgotten, that our Saviour himself repelled all the temptations of Satan with texts of scripture, and with reasons from thence, saying: "It is written." And, 'again.' "It is written: for it is written." See Matthew iv. and Luke iv. 8—12.

[q] Rufinus, who was well acquainted with the ancient christian writers, both Greeks and Latins, having put down a catalogue of the books of the Old and New Testament, the same which are now received by us, adds: 'These are 'the volumes which the fathers have included in the canon, and out of which 'they would have us prove the doctrines of our faith.' See Vol. iv. ch. cxv.

CHAP. CXXXVII.

EUCHERIUS, BISHOP OF LYONS.

1. EUCHERIUS,[a] bishop of Lyons in Gaul, flourished about the year 434. Some things have been ascribed to him, which are not allowed to be his. The generally received are[b] these: Forms and Phrases of Scripture, or a book of Spiritual Forms; Difficult Questions out of the Old and New Testament, with an interpretation of Hebrew names; an epistle concerning the Contempt of the World and Secular Philosophy; another epistle, in Praise of Solitude, or of the Desert. I shall quote no other beside these.

2. As Eucherius is in Gennadius, I place a part of his chapter[c] below.

3. The[d] difficult questions of the New Testament, are taken out of the gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, John; the epistle to the Romans; the first and second to the Corinthians; the epistle to the Ephesians; to the Colossians; the first and second to Timothy; the epistle to the Hebrews; the Acts of the Apostles; the epistle of James; the first epistle of John; and the Revelation: out of each book, in the order here named.

4. Though no questions are there taken out of other books of the New Testament, no doubt can be made but Eucherius received all the fourteen epistles of St. Paul, and St. Peter's two epistles, and the two latter epistles of St John, and the epistle of St Jude: the second epistle of Peter is quoted by him[e] more than once.

[a] Vid. Cav. H. L. T. i. p. 423, 424. Fabric. ad Gennad. cap. 63. Du Pin. T. iii. P. ii. p. 173. Tillem. T. xv. [b] Formulæ seu Phrases Scripturæ, seu Formularum Spiritualium Liber. Instructiones ad Salonium de Quæstionibus Veteris et Novi Testamenti. Epistola parænetica ad Valerianum cognatum de Contemtu Mundi et Secularis Philosophiæ. De Laude Eremi, seu de Vitâ Solitariâ. Ap. Bib. PP. Lugd. T. vi. p. 822—866.

[c] Eucherius, Lugdunensis ecclesiæ presbyter, scripsit ad Valerianum propinquum suum 'de Contemtu Mundi et Secularis Philosophiæ epistolam 'unam,' scholastico sermone et rationabili. Disseruit etiam ad personam filiorum Salonii et Veranii, postea episcoporum, 'Obscura quæque Sanctarum 'Capitula Scripturarum.'—Aliaque tam ecclesiasticis quam monasticis studiis necessaria. Moritur sub Valentiniano et Martiano Principibus. Gennad. De V. I. cap. 63. [d] Ap. Bib. PP. T. vi. p. 847—853.

[e] Sic Petrus in epistolâ: 'Unam vero hoc non lateat vos, carissimi, quia unus dies apud Deum sicut mille anni.' [Pet. iii. 8.] Form. Spiritual. cap. 11. p. 839. D. Vit. et cap. 5. p. 832. H.

5. Mill says, without hesitation, that[f] Eucherius had, in his copies of St. John's first epistle, the heavenly witnesses. But, in my opinion, that is far from being certain: indeed the text is found[g] in the book of Spiritual Forms, or Scripture Phrases. But let us observe the questions taken out of St. John's epistle, one of which is: 'Again,[h] John, in his epistle, says: "There are three that bear witness; water, blood, and spirit." What does that mean? Answer. Here seems a reference to what the same John writes in his gospel; "But one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, and forthwith came there out water and blood. And he that saw it, bare record." [ch. xix. 34, 35.] And he had before said; "He bowed his head, and gave up the ghost." [ver. 30.] Some therefore argue, that "the water," denotes baptism; "the blood," martyrdom; and "the spirit," the soul; which at death goes to God: but the most, by a mystical interpretation, understand the Trinity itself. The "water," they say, denotes the Father; the "blood," Jesus Christ, who died; and the "spirit," the Holy Ghost.

Eucherius, who wrote this, had not the heavenly witnesses in his copy of St. John's epistle. The text, therefore, as cited in the forementioned place and book, did not come from him; but has been made out, by some late transcriber, from modern copies of the New Testament. Eucherius had

[f] Jam enim, sub annum Christi 434, ab Eucherio Lugdunensi citatam eam reperimus, lib. Formularum Spiritualis Intelligentiæ.' Cap. xi. 3, 4. Et sane mirum, haud exstitisse ipsam jam in aliis scriptis Patrum Occidentalium, &c. Prolegom. n. 938.

[g] Ad Trinitatem in Johannis epistolâ: 'Tres sunt qui testimonium dant in cœlo, Pater, Verbum, et Spiritus Sanctus. 'Et tres sunt qui testimonium dant in terrâ, Spiritus, Aqua, et Sanguis.' Form. Spirit. cap. 11. n. 3. p. 838. E.

[h] Interr. Item in epistolâ suâ Johannes ponit: 'Tria sunt, quæ testimonium perhibent, aqua, sanguis, et spiritus.' Quid in hoc indicatur? Resp. Simile huic loco etiam illud mihi videtur, quod ipse in evangelio suo de passione Christi loquitur, dicens: 'Unus militum lanceâ latus ejus aperuit, et continuo 'exivit sanguis et aqua. Et qui vidit, testimonium perhibet.' In eodem ipse de Jesu supra dixerat: 'Inclinato capite reddidit spiritum.' Quidam ergo ex hoc ita disputant. Aqua baptismum: Sanguis videtur indicare martyrium: Spiritus vero est, qui per martyrium transit ad Dominum. Plures tamen hic ipsam interpretatione mysticâ intelligunt Trinitatem, eo quod Perfecta ipsa perhibeat testimonium Christo. Aqua Patrem indicans, quia ipse de se dicit: 'Me dereliquerunt, fontem aquæ vivæ.' [Jerem. ii. 13.] Sanguine Christum demonstrans, utique per passionis cruorem: Spiritu vero Sanctum Spiritum manifestans. Hæc autem tria de Christo testimonium ita perhibent, ipso in evangelio loquente: 'Ego sum qui testimonium perhibeo de meipso.' [Joh. viii. 18.] Et item: 'Cum autem.' [xv. 26.] Perhibet ergo testimonium Pater, cum dicit: 'Hic est Filius meus dilectus.' [Matt. iii. 17.] Filius cum dicit: 'Ego et Pater unum sumus.' [Joh. x. 30.] Spiritus Sanctus, cum de eo dicitur: 'Et vidit Spiritum Dei descendentem, sicut columbam venientem super se.' [Matt. iii. 16.] De Qu. N. T. ib. p. 853. B. C. D.

written: 'And[i] in John's epistle: "There are three that 'bear witness; the "water, the blood, and the spirit:"' but some transcriber filled up the quotation out of his late copies. The reading, without the heavenly witnesses, does as well suit the design of the author, or better, than with them: for he is there explaining, or showing the mystery of numbers. 'Number I.' he says, 'refers to the unity of 'God: Number II. refers to the two testaments of the di-'vine law: Number III. to the Trinity. So, in John's epis-'tle: "There are three that bear witness: the water, the 'blood, and the spirit."' So I think, Eucherius wrote: and in this manner the two places, in those two works, perfectly agree and harmonize.

I hope the account which I have here given of this matter, may be satisfactory to the reader.

Nevertheless, since writing what is above, I have observed, that J. A. Bengelius, referring to the book of 'Spi-'ritual Forms,' says, 'that[k] the disputed text in St. John is 'plainly quoted by Eucherius.' And before that, referring to the books of the Questions out of the Old and New Testament, he says: 'Eucherius,[l] but different from him to be 'afterwards mentioned, does not quote it:' what reasons Mr. Bengelius has for thinking those two works to have been composed by two different authors, I cannot tell. Eucherius, bishop of Lyons, had two sons, Veranius, and Salonius, or Saloninus; to the former, he inscribed his book of 'Spiritual Forms;' to the other, the work of 'Difficult 'Questions.' About this there is no dispute among learned men, that I know of; however, I shall now[m] refer to some other, beside those referred to at the beginning of this chapter.

The preceding argument, therefore, remains in full force, so far as I can perceive.

This whole chapter, as it now is, was finished by me be-

[i] I. Hic numerus ad unitatem Deitatis refertur.—II. Ad duo testamenta divinæ legis referuntur.—III. Ad Trinitatem, in Johannis epistolâ.—'Tres 'sunt qui testimonium dant, Aqua, Sanguis, et Spiritus.' Formul. Spiritual. cap. 11. p. 838. [k] Sect. xv. Et apertissime Eucherius Lugdunensis. Versum 7, et 8, distincte citat in libro Formularum Spiritualis Intelligentiæ: de numeris agens, Bengel. N. T. Gr. p. 753.

[l] Non citat Eucherius, sed diversus ab illo, de quo, sect. xv. in Quest. N. T. Id. ibid. p. 750. [m] De uxore duos filios suscepit, Veranium et Saloninum, quibus et libros nuncupavit; Veranio librum Formularum Spiritualis Intelligentiæ; Salonino vero duos, priorem de Quæstionibus difficilioribus Veteris et N. T. posteriorem de Hebr. nominum interpretatione. S. Basn. ann. 441. n. v. Vid. et Hod. de Text. Orig. p. 397. et Pagi an. 441. n. iv.—x.

fore the publication of the second volume of Mr. Wetstein's New Testament: what he says of Eucherius Lugdunensis may be seen at p. 725 of the said volume.

CHAP. CXXXVIII.

CÆCILIUS SEDULIUS.

1. FOR a particular account of CÆLIUS, or CÆCILIUS SEDULIUS, and the works ascribed to him, I refer to[a] several: he is in[b] Trithemius; and I would have transcribed his article, but that it is full of faults, and therefore not to be relied upon in any thing. Fabricius says, that[c] Trithemius seems to have confounded three of that name: Sedulius the poet, who lived in the fifth century; and two others, of later ages. Therein he follows[d] Labbé, whom he quotes; whose account of Sedulius is also particularly commended by Bayle. It is commonly said, that Sedulius was a Scot; that is, a native of Ireland: but[e] there is no proof of it in ancient authors.

2. Tillemont,[f] after having weighed what has been said by others, concludes, that Sedulius wrote between 425 and 450; I shall therefore place him, with Cave, at 434.

3. It is probable, that Sedulius was a presbyter, as he is called by[g] Isidore of Seville; and not a bishop, as some have supposed.

[a] Vid. Ph. Labb. Diss. de Ser. Ec. T. ii. p. 328, 329, 330, &c. Cav. H. L. T. i. Du Pin, Bib. Ec. T. ii. P. ii. p. 75. Tillem. Mem. T. xii. Fabric. Bib. Lat. l. iv. c. 2. p. 306, 307. et Bib. Ec. ad Isid. Hisp. c. 7. et ad Trithem. cap. 142. See likewise Sedulius, in Bayle's Dictionary.

[b] De Ser. Ec. cap. 142. [c] Videtur Trithemius in unum confundere tres Sedulios, poëtam seculo quinto clarum, et episcopum, qui A. C. 721, et auctorem Hibernum Collectaneorum in epistolas Pauli, qui centum post annis vixit. Fabr. ad Trith. cap. 142. Ap. Bib. Ec.

[d] An Sedulius poëta fuit Scotus? Nullus id veterum dixit. Recentiores ὁμωνυμίᾳ delusi tres in unum Sedulios confuderunt, ac poëtam seculo quinto florentem cum episcopo, qui anno 721, et cum sacræ scripturæ interprete, seu Collectaneorum Auctore, qui centum post annis vivebat, Scotis temere accensuerunt. Nec ad rem faciunt quæ Usserius partim ex Trithemio, Labb. de Ser. Ec. T. ii. p. 330.

[e] See before, Labbé, in note[d]; and Sedulius, in Bayle's Dictionary, note [c].

[f] See Sedulius, in his Mem. Ec. T. xii. p. 612. and note [i].

[g] De Ser. Ec. cap. 7.

4. The only two pieces rightly ascribed to him, and still extant, are entitled,[h] A Paschal Poem, and A Paschal Work: or, A Paschal Work, in verse; and A Paschal Work, in prose. The former is sometimes divided into[i] four, at other times into[k] five books. The first book exhibits the most remarkable things in the Old Testament; the three or four following, contain the history of our Lord, taken from the four gospels: and it is generally allowed that the poem has in it a good deal of elegance. The Paschal Work, in[l] five books, represents, in prose, the same things which had been before celebrated in metre, by the same author.

5. The two works of this ingenious presbyter bear testimony to the four evangelists, and their gospels; whose names with their symbols, he particularly mentions,[m] at the conclusion of his first book.

6. I do not observe in him the doxology at the end of the Lord's Prayer, which we now have in St. Matthew: it is probable that it was wanting in this author's copy. He has the address, or appellation, at the beginning, and the following petitions: and[n] he distinctly paraphraseth all in each of his works, that in metre, and that in prose; but there is no notice taken in either, of a doxology at the end.

[h] Carmen Paschale: Opus Paschale. [i] Ap. Bib. PP. Max. T. 6. p. 460, &c. [k] In edit. Cellarian. Hal. Magdeb. 1704.

[l] Ap. Bib. PP. ib. p. 472, &c.

[m] Christe fave votis——
Hoc Matthæus agens hominem generaliter implet.
Marcus ut alta fremit vox per deserta leonis.
Jura sacerdotis Lucas tenet ore juvenci.
More volans aquilæ, verbo petit astra Joannes,
Quatuor hi proceres, unâ te voce canentes,
Tempora seu totidem latum sparguntur in orbem.
Sic et apostolici semper duodenus honoris
Fulget apex, numero menses imitatus et horas.
Ib. p. 462. D. D. Conf. p. 476. G.

[n] Vid. ib. p. 464. et p. 481, 482.

CHAP. CXXXIX.

ANOTHER SEDULIUS.

1. I SHALL here add some extracts out of a work of another SEDULIUS; certainly different from Sedulius the poet, of the fifth century. He[a] seems to have been a Scot, of Ireland, and to have flourished in the ninth century, about the year 818. He[b] wrote a Commentary upon St. Paul's fourteen epistles, which is called 'Collectaneum;' it being a collection out of Origen, Hilary, Jerom, Augustine, and other ancient writers. It appears, from this Commentary, that[c] Sedulius understood Greek; and probably Hebrew,[d] likewise.

2. In Acts xx. 28. he[e] read the 'church of the Lord,' where we have, in our copies, "the church of God." And in the same place he observes, 'that they who, at ver. 17th of that chapter are called "elders of the church" at Ephesus, at the 28th ver. are called "bishops:" so that elders and bishops were then all one. But afterwards, he says, for preventing contention, it was appointed, that there should be but one bishop in a church;' which last observation is again mentioned[f] in another place, as from Jerom.

3. At Rom. i. 32. This author seems to have read:

[a] Vid. Cav. H. L. T. i. in Sedulio, p. 425. Du Pin. T. 7. p. 177. Tillem. T. xii. Labbé de Scr. Ec. T. ii. p. 338. Pagi ann. 818. n. iii.

[b] Sedulii Scoti Hiberniensis in omnes S. Pauli epistolas Collectaneum. Ap. Bib. PP. Lugdun. T. vi. p. 494—588.

[c] Qui Sedulius, non ille quidem Cælius Sedulius, qui seculo quinto carmina quædam et alia opuscula edidit, sed alter Sedulius Scotus Hiberniensis, qui nono seculo floruit. Hunc ipsum esse, tum nomen cognomenque suadent, tum etiam peritia Græcæ linguæ, quam in Commentariis suis in epistolas Pauli, jamdiu editis, præfert Sedulius ille Scotus. Nam frequenter ibi de lectione Græcâ, nec prorsus indocte, disserit. Unde Commentarii pro illâ ætate inter præstantiores computandi sunt. Montfauc. Palaiogr. Gr. l. iii. c. 7. p. 236.

[d] Vid. in Rom. cap. i. p. 494. G. et alibi.

[e] 'Attendite vobis, et omni gregi, in quo vos Spiritus Sanctus posuit episco-'pos, pascere ecclesiam Domini, quam acquisivit per sanguinem suum.' Et hic diligentius observato, quomodo unius civitatis Ephesi presbyteros vocans, postea episcopos dixerit. Hæc propterea, ut ostenderemus, apud veteres eosdem fuisse presbyteros quos episcopos. Paulatim vero, ut dissensionum plantaria evellerentur, ad unum omnium solicitudinem esse dilatam. Id. Ep. ad Tit. cap. i. p. 579. A.

[f] Hac causâ prohibitum est, duos episcopos esse in unâ civitate. In 1 Cor. i. ver. 12. p. 537. E.

'And[g] not only they that do them, but they also that have pleasure in them;' which Mill supposes to be the right reading: but I do not perceive him to take any notice of Sedulius. This reading we saw also in Isidore of Pelusium, not[h] long ago.

4. Rom. xii. 13. 'Distributing to the necessities of saints.' So[i] this text appears in the edition of Sedulius's Commentary: but it seems to be implied, in his explanation, that he did not read 'necessities,' but 'memories,' or 'memorials:' however, he mentions two interpretations, one suiting our common reading. Of this matter we spoke formerly, in the chapter of[k] Optatus.

5. Upon Rom. xv. 24. he says, it[l] was uncertain whether Paul ever went into Spain.

6. Upon Rom. xvi. 21. he observes: Some[m] said that Lucius was the evangelist, generally called Luke.

7. Upon 1 Cor. v. 9, 'I have written to you in an epistle; that is,[n] says he, 'I write:' and meaning therefore, certainly, in this epistle. Pelagius[o] understood this place in the same manner.

8. Upon 1 Cor. xi. 25, "Not discerning the Lord's body:" that is,[p] says he, not distinguishing it from common food.

9. Upon 1 Cor. vi. 2, he says, that[q] "the first day of the week" means the Lord's day.

10. Heb. xi. 37, "They wandered about in sheepskins, and goatskins." Sedulius[r] must have in his copy that

[g] Non solum qui faciunt, sed etiam qui consentiunt facientibus. In Rom. i. p. 498. H.

[h] See in this volume, ch. cxxix. p. 12.

[i] 'Necessitatibus sanctorum communicantes.' Manifestum est, quia qui preces suas exaudiri vult, æmulus debet esse vitæ sanctorum: ut hoc sit memorem esse, et communicatorem, imitaret actus illorum. Aliter: 'Memores [an memoriis?] sanctorum communicantes:' hoc est, ministrantes eis, qui propter Christum omnia contemnentes, alienis ad tempus indigent ministeriis. In Rom. xii. p. 531. F.

[k] See Vol. iv. ch. cv.

[l] Utrum vero in Hispaniam venerit, incertum. p. 535. A.

[m] Lucium quidam perhibent esse Lucam, qui evangelium scripsit; pro eo quod soleant nomina interdum secundum patriam declinationem, interdum etiam secundum Græcam, Romanamque proferri. Ib. p. 536. D.

[n] 'Scripsi vobis.' Pro Scribo. Vel ideo præteritum dicit, quia cum legeretur, tempus scribendi præteritum esset. p. 540. C.

[o] See vol. iv. ch. cxxv. p. 2.

[p] 'Non dijudicans corpus Domini.' Id est, non discernens ipsum a cibo communi. p. 545. F.

[q] 'Per unam Sabbati.' Una sabbati Dominica dies est, ut Dominicâ dies paulatim congregarentur per tempus, ne plus gravarentur. Ideo autem in Dominico hoc permissum est, quia non opus est servile, eleëmosynam congregare. p. 549. B.

[r] 'Circumierunt in melotis.' Ut Helias, et Joannes, aliique multi. Est autem melota pellis caprina, ex uno latere dependens, quâ monachi utuntur Ægyptii. p. 588.

word only, which we have rendered 'sheepskins;' which he also explains, and says, it signifies 'goatskins.'

This passage of our author brought to my mind the observation of that excellent critic, Ludolph Kuster, in the preface to his edition of Mill's New Testament; that[s] 'goatskins' is a scholion, or marginal interpretation of the other word, which has been brought into the text: and he says, that this is agreeable to Hesychius, who informs us, that the word 'melote' is used for the skins of goats, and any four-footed animals.

So Kuster: in whom this observation is only a conjecture, though very ingenious and probable. But here is an ancient author, who had this reading: and it is found in some other authors; particularly in the Commentary upon St. Paul's epistles, ascribed by some[t] to Primasius, bishop of Adrumetum in Africa, about the year 550: but by others,[u] that Commentary is ascribed to Remigius, a presbyter, in the ninth century. That every one may judge of this, I transcribe him largely[v] below. The text of this verse, in our present editions of Primasius, is the same as in our copies of the New Testament: but his comment must induce us to think that he read but one word, the same which is rendered by us 'sheepskins.'

To Primasius I add Œcumenius: for though in him also the[w] text is given, as in our copies; yet his comment plainly shows, that[x] he read only the first of these two words.

[s] Pari ratione Hebr. xi. 37. *εν αιγειοις δερμασιν* proculdubio est scholion et interpretamentum ejus, quod proxime præcedit, *εν μηλωταις*. Vide Hesychium V. *Μηλα*, qui te docebit vocabulum illud sensu quidem latiore interdum dici de quibusvis quadrupedibus, proprie autem et præcipue de ovibus et capris. Unde consequitur, *μηλωτην* quoque et *αιγειον δερμα* proprie unum idemque significare; et proinde posterius, tamquam clarius et notius, dicto loco ad Hebræos, prioris esse interpretamentum. Lud. Kuster.

[t] Vid. Cav. H. L. T. i. p. 525. S. Basnag. Annal. 552. n. ix. x. Hod. de Bibl. Text. Orig. l. iii. p. 2. cap. 6. p. 401.

[u] Vid. Cav. H. L. T. ii. p. 62, 63. I. Le Long. Bibl. Sacr. T. ii. p. 913.

[v] 'Circuierunt in melotis, in pellibus caprinis, egentes.' Heliam in hoc loco debemus intelligere et alios, qui taliter egerunt. Melotam dicunt quidam genus esse vestimenti ex pellibus caprinis, ex uno latere dependens, quo genere vestimenti propter asperitatem in Ægypto monachi dicuntur uti. Helias quoque legitur usus illo fuisse. Et *μηλον* Græce ovis dicitur, vel quadrupes quodlibet. Unde *μηλωτη* pellis ovina. At vero quidam dicunt, ex pellibus taxi genus vestimenti esse compositum. Est enim animal, quod taxus vocatur, solitus in cavernis terræ habitare, cujus pellis hispida esse fertur, a quo nomine derivatur vocabulum hujus vestis, id est, a melo melota. Primas. Comm. in Hebr. ap. Bib. PP. Lugd. T. x. p. 279. E. F.

[w] Vid. Œcum. T. ii. p. 415. A.

[x] *Περιηλθον εν μηλωταις, οἱον ὁ Ελιας, ὁ Ελισαιος.* Id. ib. p. 416. B.

I shall now put below a valuable observation of Mr. Wetstein.[y]

I have not, at present, any other ancient writers to allege in favour of this reading; but perhaps some more may be observed hereafter.

However, we are told by Jerom, that[z] in his time a covering made of goatskin, was called a 'melote:' it was worn, he says, by the monks in Egypt. John Cassian likewise, describing the garments of the Egyptian monks, mentions a[a] goatskin; which, he says, they call 'melote.' How the word 'melote' was understood in the fourth century, may be argued also from Gregory Nyssen; who says that[b] Elias wore goatskins.

And the Greek lexicographers assure us, that 'melote' denotes a skin made of any four-footed animal: so Hesychius, to whom Kuster refers: whom[c] I transcribe more at large: so also[d] Suidas.

I might add, that 'melote' is the only word in the Greek version of the Old Testament, where the garment of Elijah and Elisha is mentioned. See 1 Kings xix. 13, 19; 2 Kings ii. 8. 13, 14.

It may be farther observed, that in all the Greek copies of this verse, and in[e] the Latin versions, and generally[f] in the citations of it by Greek and Latin authors, the copulative is wanting. Our English version has it thus: "They wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins;" but in the Greek, and elsewhere, as just mentioned, it is, 'in sheepskins, in goatskins.' This affords a great deal of reason to think, that 'goatskins' is only a marginal interpretation, which has been brought into the text.

If it should be said, that the present reading is the read-

[y] Œcumenius scripsit in Acta et epistolas apostolorum. Textus autem sacer ad editiones potius N. T. Erasmiani, quam ad fidem Codicum MSS. expressus est. J. J. Wetst. Prolegom. ad N. T. Tom. i. p. 78. Vid. et Tom. ii. p. 867. [z] Nihil habent in cellulis, præter psiathium, et caprinam pelliculam, quam melotem vocant. Hieron. Ep. 108. T. iv. P. 2. p. 810. [a] Ultimus est habitus eorum pellis caprina, quæ melote vel pera appellatur, et baculus. Qui tamen habitus pellis caprinæ significat, mortificatâ omni petulantiâ carnalium passionum, debere eos in summâ virtutum gravitate consistere. I. Cass. de Cœnob. Instit. l. i. c. 8. ap. B. PP. T. vii. p. 19. F. Conf. Evagr. Monach. Capita ap. Coteler. Monum. Gr. Ec. T. iii. p. 69. Med. [b] —— *ὁ μεν δερμασιν αιγειοις— σκεπαζομενος.* De Virg. cap. 6. T. iii. p. 134.

[c] *Μηλα κοινως μεν παντα τα τετραποδα· ὁθεν και πασα βυρσα, ο ἐστι παν δερμα, μηλωτη λεγεται.* Hesych. [d] *Μηλωτη· ζωνη εκ δερματος.* Suid. [e] Circuierunt in melotis, in pellibus caprinis. Hieron. et Bez. [f] *Ανδρες περιεχομενοι κατα την ερημον εν μηλωταις, εν αιγειοις δερμασιν, ὑστερημενοι.* Socrat. H. E. l. iv. c. 24. p. 239. D.

ing of all manuscripts, even the most ancient, particularly the Alexandrian, the answer is not difficult. This shows, that the common reading is very ancient: but it does not follow, that it is right; when there is so much evidence to the contrary, from the quotations of divers ancient writers, and from the thing itself.

If it be still urged, that both words are in[g] the epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, where this text is quoted or referred to; I answer, that we have but one copy only of that epistle, and it is a part of the Alexandrian manuscript; nevertheless, the agreement with the present reading of this verse, in[h] the epistle to the Hebrews, is not exact.

I hope it may be excused, that I have dwelt so long upon this one reading. Considering the observation of Mr. Kuster before mentioned, I expected some particular notice to be taken of it by his successors, in collecting various readings: but I see nothing material relating to it, either in Mr. Bengelius, or Mr. Wetstein; though it now appears to be the reading of at least three ancient writers, just alleged; which seems to show, that some things may escape the most exact and diligent.

11. There are many other readings, and explications of texts, in Sedulius, that deserve notice; but I forbear to add any more, out of regard to brevity.

12. It appears, from this Commentary, that Sedulius received all the books of the New Testament in general, and particularly the[i] book of the Revelation.

CHAP. CXL.

LEO, BISHOP OF ROME.

1. LEO[a] the first, surnamed the Great, was chosen bishop of Rome in 440; and died in 461, having sat in that see twenty-one years.

2. It is needless to say, he quotes the gospels, and Acts,

[g] Οἵτινες ἐν δέρμασιν αἰγείοις καὶ μηλωταῖς περιεπάτησαν. Clem. cap. 17. in. [h] —— περιῆλθον ἐν μηλωταῖς, ἐν αἰγείοις δέρμασιν. Hebr. xi. 37. [i] In Ep. ad Roman. cap. i. p. 495. A.

[a] Vid. Cav. H. L. T. i. Pagi Ann. 440. 2. 461. n. 3, 4. Basnag. Ann. 440. n. 5, 6. Du Pin, Bib. T. iii. P. ii. p. 120, &c. Tillem. T. xv. Fabric. Bib. Lat. T. iii. p. 526. Mr. Bower's History of the Popes, Vol. ii. p. 7—140.

and other books of the New Testament, which were always received: he quotes also often[b] the epistle to the Hebrews, the[c] epistle of James, the first epistle of Peter, and the first epistle of John, and once or twice[d] the book of the Revelation. I do not now recollect any quotation of the second epistle of Peter; nevertheless, it may be reckoned undoubted, that he received it: and perhaps he may be thought to refer to 2 Pet. i. 14, in some words, which[e] I place below; though he might intend only John xxi. 18.

3. He cites 1 Pet. ii. 23, after this manner: 'When[f] he suffered, he threatened not, but yielded himself to him that judged righteously.'

4. He cites[g] 1 John v. 7, without the heavenly witnesses, which he plainly had not in his copies.

5. His respect for scripture, and general divisions of it will appear in the following passages:

6. 'This,'[h] he says, 'is the cause of errors and heresies, that men follow their own fancies, and attend not, as they ought, to the doctrine of the prophets, apostles, and evangelists.'

7. 'The[i] Holy Ghost instructs us in the law, the prophets, the gospel, and the apostles.'

8. 'What[k] reason can there be, why we should re-

[b] Nam qui ait: Sine fide impossibile est placere Deo, [Hebr. xi. 6.] idem dicit: 'Si habuero omnem fidem,' &c. [1 Cor. xiii.] Leon. Serm. 44. cap. ii. p. 110. edit. Quesnel. Lugdun. 1700. Vid. et Serm. 23. cap. vi. Serm. 57. cap. v. [c] Dicente beato apostolo Jacobo: 'Si quis vestrûm 'indiget sapientiâ, postulet a Deo,' &c. [Jac. i. 5.] Serm. 48. cap. iv. et passim. [d] —— memorque sis ejus sententiæ, quæ dicit: 'Tene quod habes, ne alius accipiat coronam tuam.' [Apoc. iii. 11.] Ep. 80. [al. 53.] cap. vi. p. 300. [e] Nec aut dubius de provectu operis, aut de spatio tuæ ignarus ætatis, tropæum crucis Christi Romanis arcibus inferebas. Serm. 80. cap. v. p. 165.

[f] Hoc enim docet beatus Petrus apostolus, dicens:—Qui, cum malediceretur, non maledicebat; cum pateretur, non comminabatur. Tradebat autem judicanti se injuste. Serm. 63. c. iv. p. 139.

[g] 'Hic est qui venit per aquam et sanguinem, Jesus Christus; non in aquâ 'solum, sed in aquâ et sanguine. Et Spiritus est, qui testificatur, quoniam 'Spiritus est veritas. Quia tres sunt qui testimonium dant, Spiritus, aqua, et 'sanguis; et tres unum sunt.' Spiritus utique sanctificationis, et sanguis redemtionis, et aqua baptismatis; quæ tria unum sunt, et individua manent, nihilque eorum a sui connexione sejungitur. Ep. 24. [al. 10.] cap. v. p. 245.

[h] Sed in hanc insipientiam cadunt, qui cum ad cognoscendam veritatem aliquo impediuntur obscuro, non ad propheticas voces, non ad apostolicas literas, nec ad evangelicas auctoritates, sed ad semetipsos recurrunt. Et ideo magistri erroris existunt, &c. Ep. 24. [al. 10.] cap. i.

[i] —exhortante et instruente Spiritu Sancto per legis testificationem, per vaticinia prophetarum, et per evangelicam tubam, apostolicamque doctrinam. Serm. 39. cap. 3. [k] Quid ergo opus est, in cor admittere quod lex non docuit, quod prophetia non cecinit, quod evangelii veritas non

ceive what is not taught by the law or the prophets, the evangelists or apostles?'

9. He says, 'We[l] ought not, in the least, to dissent from the evangelical and apostolical doctrine; nor to understand the divine scriptures otherwise than the blessed apostles and our fathers have learned and taught.'

Which is somewhat ambiguous: If by 'our fathers' are intended men different from the apostles and evangelists, and they are placed in equal authority with the apostles, I humbly conceive, this is not sound doctrine, or agreeable either to scripture, or the sentiments of christians in the most early times; but I do not think it needful so to understand him: it cannot be reasonable to think, that he equalled any men, after the apostles, or their writings, to the divine scriptures, or[m] the divine oracles.

10. He charges[n] the Manichees with rejecting the law and the prophets; and with taking some things from, and adding others to, the gospels and the apostles; and calls them adversaries of truth.

11. He likewise charges[o] the Priscillianists with using apocryphal scriptures, written in the names of apostles; and orders them to be burned.

12. Let me now add a few things of a different kind.

13. Leo supposeth, that[p] St. Peter, after having taught the Jews of Judea, founded the church at Antioch; and, afterwards, instructed the people of Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia: he says, that[q] Peter was at Rome in the reign of the emperor Claudius; and[r] that he

prædicavit, quod apostolica doctrina non tradidit? Ep. 15. [al. 93.] cap. 12. [l] Et cum ab evangelicâ, apostolicâque doctrinâ ne uno quidem verbo liceat dissidere, aut aliter de scripturis divinis sapere, quam beati apostoli et patres nostri didicerunt atque docuerunt. Ep. 62. [al. 42.] cap. 1. [m] Cum semper nos, dilectissimi, gaudere in Domino omnia divina eloquia exhortentur, &c. Serm. 27. cap. 1.

[n] Isti, de quibus loquimur, adversarii veritatis, legem per Mosem datam, et inspirata divinitus prophetarum oracula respuerunt, ipsasque evangelicas et apostolicas paginas, quædam auferendo, et quædam inserendo violaverunt. Serm. 33. cap. iv. Vid. et S. 8. c. iv. [o] Apocryphæ autem scripturæ, quæ sub nominibus apostolorum multarum habent seminarium falsitatum, non solum interdicendæ, sed etiam penitus auferendæ sunt, atque ignibus concremandæ. Ep. 15. [al. 93.] cap. 15. [p] Jam populos, qui ex circumcisione crediderant, erudieras: jam Antiochenam ecclesiam, ubi primum christiani nominis dignitas est orta, fundaveras: jam Pontum, Galatiam, Cappadociam, Asiam, atque Bithyniam, legibus evangelicæ prædicationis impleveras. Serm. 79. cap. 5. [q] Nec mundi dominam times Romam, qui in Caiaphæ domo expaveras sacerdotis ancillam. Numquid aut judicio Pilati, aut sævitiâ Judæorum, minor erat vel in Claudio potestas, vel in Nerone crudelitas? Ib. c. 4. [r] Ad quam beatus coapostolus tuus, vas electionis, et specialis magister Gentium, Paulus occur-

had the honour of martyrdom, together with Paul, at Rome, in the time of Nero, whose persecution was general, and the first heathen persecution which the christians suffered.

14. This bishop of Rome does, in an extravagant manner, vaunt[s] the supremacy of his see, and the pre-eminence of Peter above the other apostles; and[t] he improves the words of 1 Pet. ii. 9, to subserve his purpose of exalting the see of Rome.

CHAP. CXLI.

SALVIAN.

I. *His time, and works, and character.* II. *His testimony to the scriptures.* III. *Select passages.*

I. SALVIAN, presbyter of Marseilles, of whom some notice was taken by us[a] formerly, is placed, by[b] Cave, as flourishing about the year 440, and afterwards. He is spoken of as flourishing about 440, because[c] in that year, he finished his treatise of Providence, one of his principal works; he is in Gennadius, a part of whose chapter I transcribe[d] below: he mentions some works of Salvian beside

rens, eodem tibi consociatus est tempore, quo omnis pudor, omnisque libertas, sub Neronis laborabat imperio. Cujus furor per omnium vitiorum inflammatus excessum, in hunc eum usque torrentem suæ præcipitavit insaniæ, ut primus nomini christiano atrocitatem generalis persecutionis inferret. Ib. cap. v.

[s] Sed hujus muneris sacramentum ita Dominus ad omnium apostolorum officium pertinere voluit, ut in beatissimo Petro apostolorum omnium summo principaliter collocârit; et ab ipso, quasi quodam capite, dona sua velit in corpus omne manere. Ep. 10. [al. 89.] cap. 1. Et tamen de toto mundo unus Petrus eligitur, qui et universarum gentium vocationi, et omnibus apostolis, cunctisque ecclesiæ partibus, præponatur; ut, quamvis in populo Dei multi sacerdotes sint, omnes tamen proprie regat Petrus, quos principaliter et regit Christus. Serm. 3. cap. 2. vid. et cap. 3, et 4.

[t] Isti sunt [Petrus et Paulus] qui te ad hanc gloriam provexerunt, ut 'gens 'sancta, populus electus, civitas sacerdotalis et regia,' per sacram beati Petri sedem caput orbis effecta, latius præsideres, religione, quam dominatione terrenâ, &c. Serm. 80. cap. 1.

[a] See Vol. ii. ch. xxix.

[b] H. L. T. i. p. 433.

[c] Vid. Pagi Ann. 440. n. 6. et Ann. 490. n. 25.

[d] Salvianus, Massiliensis ecclesiæ presbyter, humanâ et divinâ literaturâ instructus, et, ut absque invidiâ loquar, episcoporum magister, scripsit scholastico et aperto sermone multa. Ex quibus legi——Adversus Avaritiam libros quatuor.—Et in morem Græcorum, de principio Genesis usque ad conditionem

those now extant; which are, the forementioned treatise, Of Providence, or the Divine Government, in eight books; Against Covetousness, in four books; Epistles, nine in number. Gennadius says, he might, without offence, call Salvian a master of bishops; and, among his works, reckons many homilies, which were preached by bishops, not so well qualified to compose for themselves. Salvian is a very agreeable writer: he was living when Gennadius wrote his book of Illustrious Men, that is, in 485, as Tillemont[e] computes. Other learned men are for a later date of that work of Gennadius; thinking it not written[f] till 494, or thereabout.

II. Salvian seems to have received all the books of the New Testament which we do.

1. The[g] book of the Acts is often and largely quoted by him: he[h] quotes the epistle to the Hebrews, as the apostle Paul's; he also quotes the[i] epistle of St. James, the[k] second epistle of St. Peter, and the[l] book of the Revelation.

2. His general divisions of the sacred scriptures are such as these: First,[m] the law; then, the prophets; thirdly, the gospel; fourthly, the apostles. Again: the[n] Old and New Testament; the law, the prophets, the apostles, the gospels;

hominis, compositum versu exaëmeron librum unum, Homilias episcopis [vel ad episcopos] factas multas. Vivit usque hodie senectute bonâ. Genn. de V. I. cap. 67.

[e] Mem. Ec. T. xvi. sur Salvien, note 4.

[f] Vid. Basnag. Ann. 494. 6. Pagi Ann. 490. n. 20.

[g] Et ideo in apostolorum Actibus beatissimus Paulus, 'In ipso,' inquit, 'et vivimus, et movemur, et sumus.' De Gubern. Dei, l. 2. p. 34. Vid. et l. 8. p. 191. Adv. Avarit. l. iii. p. 276, 277. et alibi. Edit. S. Baluz. Paris. 1669.

[h] Si enim inquit apostolus, omnis inobedientia justam accipit mercedis retributionem, quomodo nos effugiemus, si tantam neglexerimus salutem? [Hebr. ii. 3.] Adv. Avar. l. 4. p. 229. Vid. ib. p. 310.

[i] De Gubernat. Dei, l. 3. p. 60. l. 4. p. 65. Adv. Avar. l. 1. p. 228.

[k] Quod quidem etiam beatus apostolus Petrus evidenter exposuit, dicens de vitiosis ac tepidis, id est, male viventibus christianis: 'Melius erat illis non 'cognoscere veritatem,' &c. [2 Pet. ii. 21. 22.] De Gubern. Dei, l. 4. p. 95. Vid. ib. l. 1. p. 19, 20.

[l] Unde etiam Salvator in Apocalypsi ad tepidum christianum ait: 'Utinam aut callidus esses, aut frigidus. Nunc 'autem quia tepidus es, incipiam te evomere ex ore meo.' [Apoc. iii. 15, 16.] De Gub. Dei, l. 4. p. 95. Vid. et Adv. Avar. l. 4. sub. fin. p. 310.

[m] Quæritur forsitan, quæ sint bona, quæ Deus christianis hominibus adsignet? Quæ, nisi omnia, per quæ christiani sumus? Primum scilicet legem, deinde prophetas, tertio evangelium, quarto apostolicas lectiones. De Gubern. Dei, l. 3. p. 45.

[n] Et quidem non quæro, ut cuncta faciat, quæ Testamenta duorum temporum jubent. Remitto censuram legis antiquæ. Remitto omnes prophetarum minas. Remitto etiam quæ remitti omnino non possunt, vel apostolorum librorum severissimam institutionem, vel evangelicorum voluminum plenam omni perfectionis genere doctrinam. Ibid.

prophets,[o] apostles, and gospels; gospels[p] and apostles, and the like.

3. For which he expresseth the greatest regard: for he considers the scriptures as[q] dictated by the Spirit of God, as[r] containing the revelation of the mind of God to us; from[s] whence, as well as by reason, he proves the doctrine of a Providence, which he is treating of.

III. I shall now observe a few select passages.

1. He[t] supposeth the number of "five thousand," mentioned, Acts iv. 4, to be additional to the "three thousand," in ch. ii. 41, making in all eight thousand. Nevertheless, I do not think that to be the true sense; nor yet, that the number was now "five thousand," including the "three thousand" converted by Peter's first sermon: for many of them had come from divers and remote parts to Jerusalem, to be present at the feast of Pentecost; and probably, soon after the feast was over, returned to their several countries and dwellings: nor does St. Luke say, that now five thousand were 'added' to the apostles, or to the church; but he says, that at this season, "many of them which heard the word believed," or were converted; "and the number of the men was" 'made,' εγενηθη, "five thousand;" with the addition of converts now made, the whole number of believers at Jerusalem amounted to five thousand. Many of the first three thousand were dead or removed; but from time to time new converts had been made, and at this season 'many believed;' whereby the number of believers at Jerusalem 'became five thousand.'

[o] Talis profecto secta est, quales sectatores sunt. Hoc sunt absque dubio quod docentur. Apparet itaque, et prophetas quos habent impuritatem docere, et apostolos quos legunt nefaria sanxisse, et evangelia, quibus inbuuntur, hæc, quæ ipsi faciunt, prædicare. De Gubern. l. 4. p. 92.

[p] Evangelia legunt, et impudici sunt. Apostolos audiunt, et inebriantur. Ib. p. 91. [q] Loquens in voluminibus suis sermo divinus sic ait. De Gub. l. ii. p. 31. Quod ut plenius capias, audi quid in alio scripturarum loco idem testatur Spiritus Sanctus. Ibid. Sicut etiam per divinas literas sacer sermo testatus est. L. iv. in.

[r] Sed tamen cum per scripturas sacras scire nos quasi de arcano animi ac mentis suæ quædam voluerit Deus noster, quia ipsum quodammodo scripturæ sacræ oraculum Dei mens est, quidquid vel agnosci per suos, vel prædicari Deus voluit, non tacebo. De Gub. l. ii. p. 43.

[s] Ecce evidentur dicit volumen sacrum, cuncta quotidie nutu divinitatis regi, et incessabiliter a Deo omnia gubernari. De Gub. l. ii. p. 33.—Superest, ut quia testimoniis sacris et respici ac regi a Deo omnia jam probavimus, &c. Ib. p. 35. [t] Quæ fuerit quippe tunc multitudo ecclesiæ principalis, ex hoc solo cognosci potest, quod in principiis statim ipsis octo hominum millia biduo ecclesiæ accessisse referuntur. Adv. Avar. l. iii. p. 277.

2. He[u] calls Timothy apostle, meaning, undoubtedly, apostle in a lower sense only, as equivalent to apostolical, or a companion and disciple of apostles.

3. He[v] celebrates the fortitude and patience of the primitive christians.

4. He[w] insists very much upon the general corruption of manners among christians in his time; and largely shows, that[x] it is unbecoming the christian profession, and[y] dishonourable to Christ himself.

5. Salvian assures us, that[z] they who were called heretics received the same scriptures that other christians did; the same prophets, the same apostles, and evangelists.

6. He says, moreover, that[a] heretics err innocently, at least sincerely: they believe what they profess to be true; and they think themselves to be orthodox. As they are heretics in our esteem, so are we in theirs: and how they will be treated in the day of judgment upon account of this their erroneous opinion, the Judge alone knows.

[u] Legimus Timotheum apostolum carne infirmissimum fuisse. De Gub. l. i. c. 10. [v] Omittamus ergo illa, quæ beatissimus Paulus pertulit, immo quæ in libris postea de religione conscriptis omnes admodum christianos legimus pertulisse; qui ad cœlestis regiæ januam gradibus pœnarum suarum adscendentes, scalas sibi quodammodo de eculeis catastisque fecerunt. De Gub. l. iii. p. 50. [w] Quotusquisque est, qui non se luto fornicationis involvat? Et quid plura? Grave et luctuosum est quod dicturus sum. Ipsa ecclesia, quæ in omnibus esse debet placatrix Dei, quid est aliud, quam exacerbatrix Dei? Aut præter paucissimos quosdam, qui mala fugiunt, quid est aliud pene omnis cœtus christianorum, quam sentina vitiorum? De Gub. l. iii. p. 57.—In hanc enim morum probrositatem prope omnis ecclesiastica plebs redacta est, ut in cuncto populo christiano genus quoddam sanctitatis sit, minus esse vitiosum. Ib. p. 58.

[x] Quo fit, ut etiam nos, qui christiani esse dicimur, perdamus vim tanti nominis, vitio pravitatis. Nihil enim prodest nomen habere sanctum sine moribus; quia vita a professione discordans abrogat illustris tituli honorem. Ib. p. 62. [y] De nobis enim dicitur illud, quod supra diximus: Ecce quales sunt, qui Christum colunt. Si enim bona discerent, boni essent. Postremo sancta a christianis fierent, si Christus sancta docuisset. Æstimari itaque de cultoribus suis potest ille qui colitur. Quomodo enim bonus magister est, cujus tam malos videmus esse discipulos? Vide christiani quid agant, et evidenter potest de ipso Christo sciri, quid doceat. De Gub. l. iv. p. 91, 92. [z] Eadem enim etiam illos legere quæ nos legimus, eosdem apud illos prophetas Dei, eosdem apostolos, eosdem evangelistas esse. L. v. p. 99. [a] Hæretici ergo sunt, sed non scientes. Denique apud nos sunt hæretici, apud se non sunt. Nam in tantum se catholicos esse judicant, ut nos ipsos titulo hæreticæ appellationis infament. Quod ergo illi nobis sunt, hoc nos illis. Nos eos injuriam divinæ generationi facere, certi sumus, quod minorem patre filium dicant. Illi nos injuriosos Patri existimant, quia æquales esse credimus. Veritas apud nos est. Sed illi apud se esse præsumunt—Errant ergo; sed bono animo errant, non odio, sed affectu Dei, honorare se dominum atque amare credentes. Qualiter pro hoc ipso falsæ opinionis errore in die judicii puniendi sint, nullus potest scire, nisi judex. Ib. p. 100.

CHAP. CXLII.

EUTHALIUS, BISHOP OF SULCA, IN EGYPT.

1. EUTHALIUS has been already mentioned in this[a] work. I must now give a more distinct account of him, and his performances in the service of the gospel: still referring to[b] others, those who are desirous of farther information, or who may be willing to compare several accounts together.

2. Euthalius, as is supposed, was at first deacon in the church of Alexandria, or some other city in Egypt: and afterwards bishop of Sulca; probably, in Egypt, though its situation is not certainly known.

3. In the year 458, he published an edition of St. Paul's epistles; and afterwards, about the year 490, an edition of the Acts of the Apostles, and the seven catholic epistles, having first compared them[c] with the exact copies in the library of Cæsarea in Palestine.

4. It is generally supposed, that all the books of the New Testament were at first written by the apostles and evangelists in one continued tenor, without any sections or chapters: the most ancient distinction, which we know of, is that of Eusebius's canons for the four gospels. In the year[d] 396, some learned christian, whose name is not known, divided St. Paul's epistles into chapters or lessons. This is collected from what Euthalius says in[e] his prologue to St. Paul's epistles: those chapters Euthalius made use of in his own edition of the same epistles. He added some other lesser sections, or subdivisions: he likewise collected all the testimonies, or passages, cited by St. Paul, from the Old Testament, or from other writings, marking the sec-

[a] See Vol. iii. ch. lix. and ch. lxxv. [b] Vid. Zacagn. Collectan. in Præf. n. 45, &c. Cav. Hist. Lit. Tom. i. Oxon. 1740. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. viii. p. 367, &c. Mill. Proleg. n. 941, &c. Wetsten. Proleg. ad N. T. edit. accurat. p. 73, 74. Oudin. de Scr. Ec. T. i. p. 1266.

[c] Vid. Zacagn. Collectan. p. 513. et Conf. hujus operis T. iii. ch. lix.

[d] Vid. Zacagn. in Præf. n. 48. p. 57.

[e] *Καθ' ἑκαστην δε συντομως επιτολην εν τοις ἐξης προταξομεν την των κεφαλαιων εκθεσιν, ἑνι των σοφωτατων τινι και φιλοχριστῳ πατερων ἡμων πεπονημενην. Ου μην αλλα και την των αναγνωσεων ακριβεστατην τομην, την τε των θειων μαρτυριων ευαποδεκτον εὑρεσιν ἡμεις τεχνολογησαντες ανεκεφαλαιωσαμεθα.* Euthal. Prol. ap. Zac. p. 528, 529. Conf. ib. p. 536, 537.

tions in which they were to be found. This Euthalius did when a deacon: afterwards, when bishop of Sulca, at the desire of Athanasius, who was made bishop of Alexandria in 490, he published an edition of the Acts of the Apostles, and the seven catholic epistles; now dividing these[f] also into lessons, chapters, and verses, which had never been done before; collecting also all the passages of the Old Testament, and other writings, quoted by Paul or Luke in the Acts, or by other apostles in the catholic epistles. And to the several parts of this work he prefixed a prologue or preface: I mean to St. Paul's epistles, the Acts, and the catholic epistles.

5. There are several things in the manuscript copies of Euthalius, now extant, which are not certainly known to be his. At[g] the end of his prologue to St. Paul's epistles, is a martyrdom of Paul, or a note concerning the time of St. Paul's last suffering: which is also in Œcumenius, prefixed to his Commentary upon the Acts of the Apostles. That note, as it seems, was written by the learned author before mentioned, who first divided St. Paul's epistle into chapters. There are also Arguments prefixed to all St. Paul's epistles, which are not known to be Euthalius's; nor the writer's who first divided those epistles into chapters. Zacagni thinks, they[h] belong to neither: forasmuch as Euthalius does not particularly mention them in his account of what that more ancient author had done; nor in the account of his own performance. Zacagni therefore concludes those arguments were composed by some learned man afterwards: and the transcribers of Euthalius's work in after times, inserted those Arguments, as an useful improvement of his edition. All those Arguments are likewise in Œcumenius: and in Mill's edition of the New Testament, they are prefixed to St. Paul's epistles severally, with the name of Œcumenius, as author.

6. The Argument[i] likewise of the Acts of the Apostles, and the[k] Peregrination of St. Paul subjoined to it, and the Arguments of the catholic epistles, Zacagni does not ascribe to Euthalius: he thinks there[l] is no good reason to

[f] Vid. Prolog. in Act. Ap. ap. Zacagn. p. 405, 409. et Prolog. in Cathol. Ep. p. 477. Vid. et p. 481. Et Conf. Zac. in Præf. n. 48. p. 57.

[g] Ap. Zac. Collect. p. 535, 536.

[h] Præf. n. 50. p. 60.

[i] Ap. Zac. Coll. p. 421—425.

[k] Ibid. p. 425—427.

[l] Dubitari tamen potest, an argumentum Actuum apostolorum, et Peregrinationes Pauli apostoli eidem subjunctæ, Euthalii opus existant, quippe quod ipse in fine prologi in apostolorum Actus nonnulla de Lucâ evangelistâ eorumdem scriptore posuerit, quæ cum argumenti vices supplere possint, parum verisimile est, Euthalium de novo ejusdem libri argumento conscribendo

say they are his, since Euthalius himself is silent about them. The forementioned Argument is in Œcumenius also, prefixed to the Acts of the Apostles: and the Peregrination is in Œcumenius,[m] after the Acts, or before the epistle to the Romans. The arguments of the catholic epistles are also in Œcumenius: and in Mill's New Testament they are prefixed to the said catholic epistles with the name of Œcumenius.

7. I shall now mention a few observations, and make some extracts.

8. It hence appears that, in the fifth century, all the seven catholic epistles were received at Alexandria, and in other parts of Egypt.

9. Possibly, we may also hence conclude, that the Revelation was not received there; or at least that it was not publicly read, nor so generally recommended to the use of all christians, as the other books of the New Testament: for if it had, it might be reasonable to expect, that it should have been now divided into lessons, chapters, and verses.

10. Euthalius ascribes the Acts of the Apostles to Luke. In his prologue to the Acts, he says, 'That[n] Luke the evangelist, disciple of Paul, was a physician of Antioch, and that he wrote two books: one of which, and the first, is that of the gospel; the other is this book of the Acts of the Apostles; in which he relates the ascension of Christ to heaven; the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the holy apostles; and how the disciples preached the doctrine of Christ; and what miracles they wrought by prayer and faith in him; and the divine call of Paul, from heaven, and his apostleship, and successful preaching; and, in a word, the labours of the apostles for Christ, in the midst of many dangers and difficulties.' In the prologue to St. Paul's epistles, he again calls the Acts,[o] Luke's second book.

cogitâsse. Accedit, quod nunquam asserat Euthalius, se in Novi Testamenti libris, quos illustrandos suscepit, argumenta ulla scripsisse, et quæ Pauli epistolis in ejusdem editione præfiguntur, ea alterius auctoris esse, superius ostensum est. Quamobrem idem prorsus de Actuum apostolorum et catholicarum epistolarum argumentis censendum esse videtur, ea nempe, uti et alia epistolarum Paulinarum argumenta, post vulgatam Euthalii editionem, ab aliquo pio viro edita, et ab antiquis librariis eidem inserta fuisse, quo suis codicibus majorem existimationem conciliarent. Zacag. Præf. n. liv. p. 66. Conf. Eund. p. 421. not. 4.

[m] Œcum. T. i. p. 192.

[n] *Αντιοχευς γαρ ητος ὑπαρχων το γενος, ιατρος δε επιστημην, προς Παυλε μαθητευθεις, δυο βιβλους συνεγραψατο, μιαν μεν, και προτεραν, την τε ευαγγελιε, δευτεραν δε ταυτην την περι των αποστολικων πραξεων.* Ibid. p. 410.

[o] *Και Λουκας ἱστορει εν τῃ δευτερᾳ βιβλῳ ἑαυτε.* Prol. in Paul. Ep. ib. p. 517

11. The prologue to St. Paul's epistles contains the history of Paul, collected from the Acts of the Apostles, and from his epistles, chiefly from the former; and then an enumeration of his epistles; and after that, in the third section, a farther account[p] of St. Paul's actions in the order of time, partly taken from Eusebius's Chronicle, and Ecclesiastical History. He says, 'That beside many other labours in the course of his life to bring men to the practice of virtue, Paul[q] wrote fourteen epistles, containing instructions for every part of a holy conversation.' He enumerates the epistles in this order: to the Romans; two to the Corinthians; to the Galatians; to the Ephesians; to the Philippians; to the Colossians; to the Thessalonians; to the Hebrews; the epistles to Timothy, Titus, and Philemon.

12. Euthalius placeth Paul's epistles, according to the proficiency which they had made, to whom they were sent; beginning with the least perfect, and proceeding to the more perfect. This is evident, from several things: for he says, the[r] epistle to the Romans is placed first, as containing instructions for those who had yet learned only the first principles of the gospel; this notion appears also in what [s]he says upon the epistle to the Ephesians, the fifth in order: and then he says, that[t] the epistle to the Philippians, the sixth in order, is written to the faithful who had made progress, and had brought forth good fruit. And at the end of his enumeration of the fourteen epistles, he expressly says, they[u] are placed according to the order of men's proficiency.

13. I do not think this to be an observation of any importance; but as it is uncommon, I have taken notice of it. And it is very true the apostle Paul's epistles are suited to promote the benefit of christians of all ranks, and of every degree of attainment in religious knowledge and virtue, whether greater or smaller.

14. I choose now to conclude this chapter[v] with St. Paul's

[p] Αναγκαιον δε ηγησαμην εν βραχει και τον χρονον επισημειωσασθαι τϐ κηρυγματος Παυλϐ, κ. λ. Ib. p. 529—535. Et Conf. Œcumen. T. i. p. 193—195. [q] Ετι δε και ὁλως δια της υφης των δεκατεσσαρων επιστολων τϐτων την ὁλην ανθρωποις διεγραφε πολιτειαν. Ib. p. 523.

[r] Περιεχει ϐν ἡ προς Ῥωμαιους επιστολη κατηχησιν εις Χριστον—διο πρωτη τετακται. Οἱα προς αρχην εχοντας εις Θεοσεβειαν γραφεισα. Ib. p. 523.

[s] Vid. p. 524. [t] Ἑκτη τετακται ἡ προς Φιλιππησιϐς, κατα προσαυξησιν πιστοις ὁμϐ και καρποφοροις, κ. λ. p. 525. in.

[u] Ουτως ἡ πασα βιβλος περιεχει παντοιον ειδος πολιτειων κατα προσαυξησιν. p. 528. [v] Μαρτυριον Παυλϐ τϐ αποστολϐ.

martyrdom, before[w] mentioned, drawn up in the year 396, and ascribed to the learned and pious writer who first divided St. Paul's epistles into chapters, or sections. It is to this purpose: 'In[x] the time of Nero emperor of 'the Romans, Paul the apostle, having exercised a good 'exercise, completed his testimony [or suffered martyrdom] 'at Rome, being beheaded with a sword, in the thirty and 'sixth year of our Saviour's passion, on the fifth day of the 'month Panemus, according to the Syro-Macedonians; 'which, with the Egyptians, is the fifth day of Epiphi; 'and with the Romans, the third before the Calends of 'July [that is, the 25th of June]; upon which day the 'holy apostle completed his testimony, in the sixty-ninth 'year of the advent of our Saviour Jesus Christ. The 'space of time, therefore, since his martyrdom, is three hundred and thirty years to this present consulship, the fourth 'of Arcadius, and the third of Honorius, august emperors 'and brothers;' that is, the year 396 of our Lord's nativity, according to the common account.

CHAP. CXLIII.

DIONYSIUS, FALSELY CALLED THE AREOPAGITE.

1. THAT the books of the Celestial and Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, and other works, with the name of Dionysius the Areopagite, are spurious, and were not composed by Dionysius, member of the Athenian senate, and disciple of Paul, mentioned in the Acts, is now the general opinion of learned men; but all are not agreed about the time when they were written.

2. Daillé, who examined those writings with great diligence, was of opinion, that[a] they were not published before the beginning of the sixth century; possibly about the year 520; Pearson has since argued, that[b] they were written about the year 330; Cave[c] placeth this author at the year

[w] See p. 68. [x] Επι Νερωνος τα Καισαρος Ῥωμαιων εμαρτυρησεν αυτοθι Παυλος ὁ αποστολος, ξιφει την κεφαλην αποτμηθεις, εν τω τριακοστω και ἑκτω ετει τα σωτηρια παθη̃ς τον καλον αγωνα αγωνισαμενος, εν Ῥωμῃ, κ. λ. Ap. Zacag. Monum. p. 535, 536. [a] —— omninoque videri istum, vel quinto præcipiti seculo, vel, etiam ineunte sexto vixisse, neque ante annum Christi circiter 520, fetus suos Dionysio immani fraude suppositos Dionys. Areop. et Ignat. l. i. c. 32. p. 184. Genev. 1666.

[b] Vind. Ignat. P. i. cap. 10. [c] H. L. T. i. p. 225.

362, supposing he might be the elder Appollinarius, who flourished about the middle of the fourth century; but the opinion of Daillé, or what is not very different, has generally prevailed. Samuel Basnage[d] agrees exactly with him, and confutes Pearson's arguments; nor does Tillemont[e] scruple to show the weakness of Pearson's reasonings: Pagi[f] freely owns, that they were not quoted before the year 532, and were not written till after the council of Chalcedon: Nourri supposeth that[g] they were written between the years 431 and 451, but not made public till some time after. James Basnage, whom[h] I transcribe below, says, they were written in the latter part of the fifth, or the beginning of the sixth century. So general a concurrence of opinions is there for that time. I refer in the margin[i] to some other writers. David Blondel[k] speaks of this author as writing about the year 490: and I place him at that time likewise, to oblige those who may suppose these works to have been written forty or fifty years before they were taken notice of.

3. All this is said for the sake of a Catalogue[l] of the

[d] Ann. 51. a. 60, &c.

[e] S. Dionys. l'Areopagite, note 4. Mem. Ec. T. ii.

[f] —— cum nec Eusebius, nec Hieronymus, nec Gennadius, nec ullus eorum, qui quinque primis ecclesiæ seculis vixere, mentionem illorum fecerint—et anno tantum 532 in Collatione Constantinopoli Catholicos inter et Severianos habitâ hæretici aliquid ex Dionysio Areopagitâ Catholicis objecerint, hique illorum auctoritatem flocci fecerint. Quare libri illi post pacem ecclesiæ a Constantino Magno redditam, et post Concilium Chalcedonense, elucubrati ab aliquo Dionysio juniore. Ann. 834. n. 18. Conf. ib. Ann. 875. n. 18. et Ann. 107. n. 8.

[g] Nourri App. ad. Bib. PP. Diss. 10. n. 9. p. 386. Paris. 1694.

[h] En effet ce fut à la fin du cinquième, ou au commencement du sixième siècle, que parurent les œuvres de Denys l'Aréopagite, qui furent citées la première fois l'an 533, dans la dispute des Acephales. L'auteur, qui a emprunté ce nom, a fait assez obscurement, et à sa maniere mystique, le catalogue des livres sacrés. Mais il en dit assez pour faire comprendre qu'il excluoit du Canon tous les livres que les Juifs en ont chasses. Hist. de l'Eglise, l. viii. ch. 10. p. 443.

[i] Vid Usser. Diss. de Scriptis Dionysio Areop. supposititis. Ad calcem libri de Scriptur. Sacr. et Vernac. p. 281, &c. Launoi de duobus Dionysiis. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. v. p. 3—5. Du Pin, Bib. des Aut. Ec. T. i. p. 34—38. Asseman. Bib. Or. T. i. p. 451.

[k] Des Sibylles, l. ii. ch. 20. p. 219. à Charenton. 1649.

[l] *Πασα μεν γαρ ιερα και αγιογραφος δελτος ἡ την εκ θεϐ των οντων γενητην ὑπαρξιν τε και διακοσμησιν, η την νομικην ιεραρχιαν και πολιτειαν, η των τε θειϐ λογϐ κληροδοσιων διανεμησεις και κατασχεσεις, η κριτων ιερων, η βασιλεων, σοφων, η ιερεων ενθεων συνεσιν, η παλαιων ανδρων εν ποικιλιᾳ και πληθει των ανιοντων ακατασειστον εν καρτεριᾳ φιλοσοφιαν, η των πρακτεων σοφας ὑποθηκας, η θειων ερωτων ασματα και ενθεϐς εικονας, η των εσομενων τας ὑποφητικας προαναῤῥησεις, η τας ανδρικας Ιησϐ θεϐργιας, η τας αυτϐ μαθητων θεοπαραδοτϐς και θεομιμητϐς πολιτειας και ιερας διδασκαλιας, η την κρυφιαν και μυτικην εποψιαν τϐ των μαθητων αγαπητϐ και θεσπεσιϐ η την ὑπερκοσμιον Ιησϐ θεολογιαν τοις προς θεωσιν επιτηδειοις ὑφηγησατο, και ταις ιεραις των*

books of the Old and New Testament, found in the third chapter of this author's Ecclesiastical Hierarchy; but expressed in an obscure and mysterious manner, suited to his usual way of writing.

4. I have put the whole in the margin, for the use of those who read Greek: it is not easy to be translated; but we may make a few remarks. James Basnage, in the place above cited, is clearly of opinion, that this writer mentions no books of the Old Testament, but those of the Jewish canon. It is also plain, that one of those books is the Song of Songs. And Daillé[m] says, he omits no sacred book, either of the Old or the New Testament: however, 'the be-'loved disciple' alone is expressly mentioned. It is manifest, that the author received the Revelation: and it is probable, he thought St. John's gospel to be the last written book of the New Testament; it being mentioned last, and next after the book of the Revelation.

CHAP. CXLIV.

GENNADIUS.

1. GENNADIUS, of Marseilles, is placed, by[a] Cave, at the year 495, about which time his book of Illustrious Men must have been written. In[b] the last chapter of that book he mentions his own works: the conclusion of which chapter is, 'That he had written a treatise or treatises concerning the Millennium; and concerning the Revelation of the

τελετων και θεοειδεσιν αναγωγαις συνερριζωσεν. Dionys. Areop. de Eccles. Hierarch. cap. 3. sect 4. p. 287, 288. Antverp. 1634.

[m] —— quo loco scripturæ, tum veteris tum novæ, absolutissimum canonem exhibet, singulaque utriusque volumina recenset, non quidem usitatis ac solennibus in ecclesiâ nominibus illa nuncupans, (a quo ille ubique, velut a quodam piaculo, diligentissime sibi cavet,) sed tamen ita perspicue designans ac describens, ut facile sit intelligere, nullum ab eo prætermissum esse divinum librum. Dall. ubi supra, l. i. c. 16. p. 101.

[a] Vid. Cav. H. L. T. i. et Conf. Fabr. ad Gennad. cap. ult. G. J. Voss. de Hist. Lat. ii. c. 18. H. Noris. Hist. Pelag. l. ii. c. 16. Du Pin, Biblioth. T. iii. P. ii. p. 277.

[b] Ego Gennadius, Massiliæ presbyter, scripsi adversus omnes hæreses libros octo, et adversus Nestorium libros tres, et tractatus de mille annis, et de Apocalypsi beati Johannis, et hoc opus, et epistolam de fide meâ misi ad beatum Gelasium, urbis Romæ episcopum. Gennad. de V. I. cap. C.

blessed John, that work, and an epistle concerning his faith, sent to Gelasius, bishop of Rome.'

2. The book of Illustrious Men is still extant: and I have often referred to it. The epistle to Gelasius, Concerning his Faith, is also generally supposed to be extant, though[c] it now goes by a different title, it is in the Appendix of the eighth tome of the Benedictine edition of Augustine's works.

3. But the chief reason of my placing Gennadius here is a regard to his treatises concerning the Millennium, and St. John's Revelation; which I suppose to afford a good argument that he received the Revelation as a work of St. John the apostle and evangelist.

CHAP. CXLV.

GELASIUS, BISHOP OF ROME.

1. GELASIUS, an African, succeeded Felix III. in the see of Rome, in the year 492. A decree in a council of seventy bishops, concerning canonical, ecclesiastical, and apocryphal scriptures, is ascribed to him. The genuineness of which decree is denied, or disputed, by [a] Pearson, [b] Cave, [c] Samuel and [d] James Basnage; but vindicated by [e] Pagi, and [f] Jeremiah Jones. But, whereas it has been generally placed at the year 494, Pagi says, it was not published before 496. It is not necessary that I should enter into an argument about a thing of so late a date: I shall only allege that part of the decree, which relates to the books of the New Testament.

2. After a particular enumeration of the books of the Old Testament, follows: 'The[g] order of the scriptures of the

[c] De Ecclesiasticis Dogmatibus liber, Gennadio tributus.

[a] Vindic. Ep. Ign. P. i. cap. 4. [b] Hist. L. T. i. p. 462, 463.

[c] Ann. 496. n. 9, 10. [d] Hist. de l'Egl. l. viii. c. 8. n. 7. p. 439, 440. [e] Ann. 494. n. 2—6. [f] New and Full Method, &c. vol. I. p. 189, 190. [g] Item ordo scripturarum Novi et æterni Testamenti.

Evangeliorum libri quatuor.

Secundum Matthæum liber unus. Secundum Marcum liber unus. Secundum Lucam liber unus. Secundum Joannem liber unus. Actuum Apostolorum liber unus.

Epistolæ Pauli apostoli numero xiv.

Ad Romanos epistola una. Ad Corinthios epistolæ duæ. Ad Galatas epistola una. Ad Thessalonicenses epistolæ duæ. Ad Ephesios epistola una.

'New and everlasting Testament; four books of the gos-
'pels; according to Matthew one book, according to Mark
'one book, according to Luke one book, according to John
'one book; one book of the Acts of the Apostles; the
'epistles of the apostle Paul fourteen; to the Romans one
'epistle; to the Corinthians two epistles: to the Galatians
'one epistle; to the Thessalonians two epistles; to the
'Ephesians one epistle; to the Philippians one epistle; to
'the Colossians one epistle; to Timothy two epistles; to
'Titus one epistle; to Philemon one epistle; to the He-
'brews one epistle: likewise, the Revelation of John one
'book: likewise, the seven canonical epistles; one epistle
'of the apostle James, two epistles of the apostle Peter,
'three epistles of the apostle John, one epistle of the apos-
'tle Judas Zelotes.' And it is added, 'That upon the pro-
'phetical, evangelical, and apostolical scriptures, the
'catholic church is built, by the grace of God.'

3. The reader will observe the order in which the books are placed. It deserves also to be observed, I think, that whoever were the authors of this catalogue of books of scripture, they received none for authentic and canonical, or the rule of faith, but such as were written by apostles, or supposed to be written by apostles; except the gospels according to Mark and Luke, and the Acts of the Apostles.

4. Beside these, many[h] ecclesiastical writings are mentioned, which are allowed to be made use of. After which follows[i] a long catalogue of apocryphal books, which are mentioned, and rejected. Many of which have been properly taken notice of in several parts of this work; though without particular references to this decree, which, being so late in time, was not necessary; and would have rendered this work tedious and prolix beyond my intention.

Ad Philippenses epistola una. Ad Colossenses epistola una. Ad Timotheum epistolæ duæ. Ad Titum epistola una. Ad Philemonem epistola una. Ad Hebræos epistola una.

Item Apocalypsis Joannis liber unus.

Item Canonicæ epistolæ numero septem.

Jacobi apostoli epistola una. Petri apostoli epistolæ duæ. Johannis apostoli epistolæ tres. Judæ zelotis apostoli epistola una.—Post propheticas, evangelicas, atque apostolicas scripturas, quibus ecclesia catholica per gratiam Dei fundata est, illud etiam intimandum putamus, &c. 'Concilium Romam, quo a lxx. episcopis libri sacri et authentici ab apocryphis sunt discreti, sub 'Gelasio.' Ap. Labb. Conc. T. iv. p. 1260, 1261.

[h] Et quamvis aliud fundamentum nullus possit ponere, præter id quod positum est, qui est Christus Jesus, tamen ad ædificationem nostram eadem sancta Romana ecclesia post illas Veteris vel Novi Testamenti, quas regulariter suscepimus, etiam has suscipi non prohibet. Ib. p. 1262.

[i] Notitia librorum apocryphorum, qui non recipiuntur. Ib. p. 1264.

CHAP. CXLVI.

ANDREW, BISHOP OF CÆSAREA, IN CAPPADOCIA.

1. ANDREW, bishop of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia, is placed by Cave,[a] at the year 500; though his exact time is not certainly known. He wrote[b] a Commentary upon the book of the Revelation; of which some notice must be taken by us.

2. In the preface to his work, he says, He[c] needs not to enlarge, in proving the inspiration of this book, since many ancients have borne testimony to its authority; as Gregory the Divine, Cyril, [of Alexandria,] Papias, Irenæus, Methodius, and Hippolytus.

3. Andrew divided the book of the Revelation into 24 larger, and 72 smaller sections. This he takes notice of[d] in his preface: and Arethas, who also afterwards wrote a Commentary upon this book, mentions it particularly in his[e] preface. Mill says, that Andrew herein imitated Euthalius, who had done the like for some other parts of the New Testament. I place Mill's account of this matter below,[f] at length.

4. Upon Rev. i. 9, he observes, that[g] John had been condemned to live in the island Patmos; but he does not say when, nor by whom.

5. He seems to suppose, that[h] St. John's gospel was written before the Revelation.

[a] —— vixisse videtur circa exitum seculi istius, ac claruisse anno 500. Incerta enim prorsus illius ætas; nec ulla ejus apud veteres mentio. Hist. Lit. T. i. p. 467. Conf. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. vii. p. 791. [b] Ad fin. S. Chrysost. Comment. in Johann. ed. Morell. T. viii. [c] Vid. Procem. p. 3.

[d] *Διελοντες την παρουσαν πραγματειαν εις λογους κδ΄ και οβ κεφαλαια, δια την τριμερη των κδ΄ πρεσβυτερων υποστασιν, σωματος και ψυχης και πνευματος.* p. 3. B. [e] Vid. Areth. ad Calc. T. iii. Comment. Œcum. p. 640.

[f] Andreas, Cæsareæ Cappadocum episcopus, sub finem seculi hujus quinti, Apocalypseos librum a se Commentario illustratum partitus est, ad exemplum Euthalii, in sectiones majores et minores, seu in *λογους* et *κεφαλαια*. *Λογοι* majores quædam portiones erant, Euthalianis 'Lectionibus' haud multo absimiles. Hujusmodi autem notavit Andreas xxiv. pro numero viginti quatuor Seniorum, circa thronum sedentium——*Κεφαλαια* vero, sive segmenta minora, constituit (ad numerum, uti dicit, partium, sc. 'corporis, animæ, et spiritûs,' ex quibus constabant Seniores) ter viginti quatuor, seu lxxii. apposito etiam cuique Capitulo lemmate quodam, materiam, quæ in eo tractatur, paucis indicante. Mill. Proleg. n. 998. [g] P. 8. B.

[h] *Επειπερ εν τω κατ' αυτον ευαγγελιω τοις υψηλοις και θεοπρεπεσιν υπερ παντας ενδιετρεψε' καντανθα δε, κ. λ.* p. 4. B.

6. Upon Rev. iv. 7, he mentions[i] the symbols of the four evangelists. The lion represents John; the calf, Luke; the eagle, Mark; the man, Matthew.

7. It is almost needless to observe, that[k] he elsewhere also speaks of four gospels only.

8. The[l] Acts of the Apostles are distinctly quoted by him.

9. The epistle of[m] James, and the[n] first and second[o] of Peter, are expressly quoted by him. And from the quotation of the first epistle, it appears, that Andrew supposed Peter, by Babylon, at the end of that epistle, to mean Rome.

10. There can be no question made, but he received all the books of the New Testament which we do.

11. There are, in this work, traces of the ancient interpretations of divers texts of the Revelation.

12. The[p] explications of the seals, in the sixth chapter, deserve to be taken notice of.

13. Of the sixth seal, ch. vi. 12, 13, he says: Some[q] understood all those things to be said figuratively of the siege of Jerusalem, by Vespasian.

14. Upon ch. vii. 1, he says: Some[r] understood those expressions of the calamities brought upon the Jewish people by the Romans; and said, that by 'the' "four angels standing upon the four corners of the earth," is intimated that the Jewish people should find no way to escape the divine vengeance, either by sea, or land, or any other way.

15. Upon ch. vii. 3, 'Saying, "Hurt not the earth, —— till we have sealed the servants of our God in their foreheads," and what follows, he says: Some[s] have understood that section,

[i] —— *ειτε τας αρετας τας τεσσαρας, και τα τεσσαρα ευαγγελια ὡς ἑτεροις καλως εχειν λελογισται· τω μεν λεοντος δηλωντος την ανδρειαν, και το κατα Ιωαννην ευαγγελιον, κ. λ.* p. 25. B. C.

[k] —— *και την των τεσσαρων ευαγγελιων εκπομπην εις τα τεσσαρα της γης περατα.* p. 131. B.

[l] —— *εν δε τῃ δημηγοριᾳ τω Παυλω, τῃ εν ταις Πραξεσιν.* p. 7. A.

[m] —— *ὡ δι' εργων ηττηθησαν, τουτῳ δηλωμενοι, ως φησιν ὁ μεγας Ιακωβος.* p. 73. A.

[n] *Και ἡ πρεσβυτερα δε Ρωμη Βαβυλων εν τῃ επιστολῃ Πετρου προσαγορευεται.* p. 98. E.

[o] —— *ἡ τον υπο τω μακαριω Πετρω λεχθεντα Φωσφορον, εν ταις καρδιαις των πιστων ανατελλοντα, τον Χριστω φωτισμον δηλαδη.* p. 17. A.

[p] P. 29, 30.

[q] *Και ταυτα τινες εις την επι Ουεσπασιανω βασιλεως πολιορχιαν εξελαβον ἁπαντα, των ειρημενων ἑκαστον τροπολογησαντες.* p. 34. C. D.

[r] *Ει και ταυτα τισιν υπο Ρωμαιων παλαι τοις Ιουδαιοις γεγενησθαι εξειληπται, των τεσσαρων αγγελων δηλον αυτοις νομισθεντων το επι τε γης, επι τε θαλασσης, των την οργην πειρωμενων διαδιδρασκειν αφυκτον.* p. 37. B.

[s] *Τουτο δε ει και μερικως παλαι γεγενηται, των τῳ Χριστῳ πεπιστευκοτων την της Ιερουσαλημ υπο Ρωμαιων*

as relating to the wonderful escape and preservation of the Jewish believers, when Jerusalem was besieged by the Romans. And they were confirmed in that interpretation, by what James said to Paul, Acts xxi. 20, "Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of Jews there are which believe."'

16. Upon ch. xx. 1, 2, 3. Here Andrew describes the weakening of the power of the devil by means of our Lord's death. 'Hereby,[t] as by a stronger, he who seemed to be strong was despoiled: we, who were his prey, were delivered, and he was "cast into the bottomless pit." That he was bound, and his power weakened, is apparent, from the overthrow of idolatry, and the demolition of idolatrous temples, and the ceasing of sacrifices, which were wont to be offered to dæmons. The "great chain," in the angel's hand, is an expression, accommodated to our apprehensions, denoting a restraint of the devil's power and wickedness. Whether the "thousand years," here spoken of, denote exactly that term, or only a long duration, God only knows. But it would be requisite, that the gospel should be preached for many years, before the seeds of religion and virtue could be sown, and take firm root throughout the whole world.'

17. Afterwards upon ch. xx. 7. 'Some[u] confine the above-mentioned "thousand years" to the short period of our Lord's ministry; from his baptism to his ascension to heaven; being no more than three years or three years and a half. Others think that, after the completion of six thousand years, shall be the first resurrection from the dead, which is to be peculiar to the saints alone; who are to be raised up, that they may dwell again on this earth, where they had given proofs of patience and fortitude; and that they may live here a "thousand years," in honour and plenty: after which will be the general resurrection, of good and bad. But the church receives neither of those interpretations: for we remember what our Lord said to the Sadducees, That the righteous shall be as the "angels which are in heaven" [Mark xii. 25]: as also the words of Paul, who says: "The kingdom of God is not meat and drink." [Rom. xiv. 17.] By the "thousand years," therefore, we understand,[v] the time of the preaching the gospel;' or the time of the gospel dispensation.

εκπεφευγοτων πορθησιν, εις πολλας τελωντων μυριαδας, κατα τον μεγαν Ιακωβον, τον τῳ μακαριῳ Παυλῳ το πληθος αυτων εμφαινοντα· αλλ' εν, κ. λ. p. 37, 38. [t] P. 117. [u] P. 120. E. 121. A. [v] —— τον τε ευαγγελικε κηρυγματος χρονον την χιλιετιαν εξελαβομεν. p. 121. A. B.

CHAP. CXLVII.

THE ALEXANDRIAN MANUSCRIPT, AND DIVERS STICHOMETRIES.

I. *The Alexandrian Manuscript.* II. *The Stichometry of Nicephorus.* III. *A Stichometry from Cotelerius.* IV. *Another Stichometry from the same.*

I. I NEED not here give a particular account of the celebrated Alexandrian Manuscript, preserved in the king's library; that having been already done by[a] several, especially by[b] Dr. Grabe. It consists of four volumes in[c] quarto: three of which contain the scriptures of the Old Testament, in the Greek version of the Seventy; and the fourth, the scriptures of the New Testament, but not quite complete.

The contents of the several volumes are prefixed to the first volume, and[d] written with the same hand that wrote the rest: these contents of the Alexandrian Manuscript were published long ago, by[e] Bp. Beveridge. I shall transcribe them, as they are published[f] by Dr. Grabe, in his Prolegomena to the first volume of his edition of the Seventy; referring also to Mr. Casley's Catalogue of the manuscripts of the king's library.

[a] Vid. Mill. Prolegom. in N. T. n. 1338—1340. Wetsten. Prolegom. ad accurat. N. T. edition. p. 9—11. et Prolegom. ad N. T. p. 8, &c.

[b] I. E. Grab. Prolegom. ad Septuagint. Interpr. T. i. cap. 1.

[c] Mr. Wetstein says, in folio. Codex est Veteris Novique Testamenti Græcus membranaceus in folio. Singulæ paginæ duas exhibent columnas, quarum singulæ quinquagenis circiter constant lineis. Wetsten. Prolegom. ad N. T. p. 8. Most others say, in quarto. Biblia Græca, literis majusculis exarata, 4 tomis qto. scripto seculo iv. vel v. Casl. Catal. MSS. Bib. Reg. p. 5. If it be reckoned a quarto, it is of a large form: but the volumes are not very thick.

[d] See below, note [f].

[e] Codex Canon. Ecc. Prim. Vindicat. l. ii. c. 9. n. 12. ap. Patr. Apostol. T. ii.

[f] Appellat [Cyrillus Patriarcha] Codicem istum 'scripturæ Novi et Veteris Testamenti,' quoniam utriusque Libri Canonici, ac hujus Apocryphi quoque eo continentur; uti patet ex Indice, quem ipsa librarii manus eidem codici præfixit, quemque hic verbatim, additis solum accentibus et spiritibus, quibus ille caret, describam. I. E. Grabe, Prolegom. cap. 1. n. 2. Notitia Codicis Alexandrini.

They are thus:
Genesis.[g]
Exodus.[h]
Leviticus.
Numbers.
Deuteronomy.
Joshua the son of Nun.
The Judges.
Ruth.
Together eight books.[i]
The first book of the Kingdoms.[k]
The second book of the Kingdoms.
The third book of the Kingdoms.
The fourth book of the Kingdoms.
The first book of the Remains.
The second book of the Remains.
Together six books.[l]
Sixteen prophets.[m]
Hosea, 1.
Amos, 2.
Micah, 3.
Joel, 4.
Obadiah, 5.
Jonah, 6.
Nahum, 7.
Ambacum, 8.
Zephaniah, 9.
Haggai, 10.
Zechariah, 11.
Malachi, 12.
Isaiah, 13.
Jeremiah, 14.[n]
Ezekiel, 15.
Daniel, 16.
Esther.
Tobit.
Judith.
The first book of Ezra[o] the priest.[p]
The second book of Ezra the priest.

[g] Γενεσις κοσμ. [h] Εξοδος Αιγυπτ. [i] Ὁμ βιβλια ή.
[k] Βασιλειων ά". [l] Ὁμ βιβλια ς'. [m] Προφηται ις'.
[n] Huic subnectuntur, licet in Indice haud nominentur, Βαρ χ Θρηνοι, et Επιστολη Ιερεμ, quæ est 6. caput Baruchi. Grabe, ibid.
[o] Εσζρας ὁ ἱερευς. [p] Εσζρας ά" est liber 1. Esdræ Apocryphus. Εσζρας β" est liber 1. Esdræ Canonicus. Atque huic subnexi sunt, quamvis in Indice non designati, Λογοι Νεέμια. Grabe, ibid.

The first book of Maccabees.[q]
The second book of Maccabees.
The third book of Maccabees.
The fourth book of Maccabees.
The Psalter with Odes [or hymns].[r]
Job.
The Proverbs.
The Ecclesiastes.
The Canticles.[s]
Wisdom.[t]
The Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach.[u]

The New Testament.

Four Gospels:
According to Matthew;[v]
According to Mark;
According to Luke;
According to John.
The Acts of the Apostles.
Seven catholic[w] epistles.[x]
Fourteen epistles of[y] Paul.[z]
The Revelation of John.
The first epistle of Clement.
The second epistle of Clement.

Together [a] Books.

Psalms of Solomon.[b]

Let us now make some observations:

1. This manuscript, as is allowed by all, is of great value, and high antiquity; though there is some difference among learned men, in their computations of its age. Grabe[c] thinks it might be written before the end of the fourth cen-

[q] *Μακκαβαιων λογος α'''.*

[r] *Ψαλτηριον μετ' ωδων.*

[s] *Ασματα ασματων.*

[t] *Σοφια, η παναρετος.*

[u] *Σοφια Ιησυ υἱυ Σειραχ.*

[v] Amissis viginti quinque circiter foliis, vigesimum sextum ab istis incipit verbis. Matth. xxv. 6. *Εξερχεσθε εις απαντησιν αυτυ.* Grabe, ibid.

[w] *Καθολικαι ζ.*

[x] Ibi incipit Epistola Jacobi, quam sequuntur duæ Petri, tres Joannis, et una Judæ. Grabe.

[y] *Επιστολαι Παυλυ ιδ'.*

[z] Epistolæ Pauli eodem locutæ sunt ordine, quo in nostris Bibliorum editionibus: nisi quod Epistola ad Hebræos proxime sequatur duas ad Thessalonicenses. Grabe.

[a] The figures are wanting in the manuscript.

[b] Hos adversariis sacris de La Cerda subnexos legere est; quippe a codice nostro abscissi vel deperditi sunt. Grabe.

[c] Haud diu igitur ante annum 396 exaratus videtur codex Alexandrinus, aut saltem paulo post, cum facta epistolarum Paulinarum divisio in *κεφαλαια* nondum in publicum prodiisset, aut satis innotuisset. Cum igitur et codicis nostri et Theclæ ætas in eamdem exeuntus seculi iv. periodum incidant, traditio ante dicta vero videtur simillima. Grabe, ib. sect. 5.

tury; others are of opinion, that[d] it was not written till near the end of the fifth century.

2. This[e] manuscript has some relation to the church of Alexandria; for it was brought from that city by Cyril Lucaris, patriarch of Alexandria, when he removed to the patriarchate of Constantinople: and when he made a present of it to Sir Thomas Roë, the British ambassador at Constantinople, about the year 1628, to be brought over hither as a present to the king, he affixed to it a short memorandum to this purpose: 'This[f] book of the scripture of 'the New and Old Testament, as we have received by tra- 'dition, was written by Thecla, a noble Egyptian woman, 'about thirteen hundred years ago, not long after the coun- 'cil of Nice.' Another argument of its being written at Alexandria, is, that[g] to the book of Psalms is prefixed the epistle of Athanasius to Marcellinus, concerning the Psalter; and I think it may be reckoned an argument of the same thing, that this manuscript has in it the book of the Revelation, which we can perceive to have been received by the church of Alexandria, in the fourth, fifth, and sixth, and following centuries: whilst it was rejected by the Syrians, and little regarded by many other christians in the East: to which might be added the neatness of the writing, in which[h] the Alexandrians are supposed to have excelled.

[d] Accedo igitur sententiæ Casimiri Oudini, qui ex canonibus diurnis nocturnisque in hoc codice annotatis judicavit, codicem hunc in usum monasterii Acœmitarum, adeoque a monacho Acœmitâ exaratum fuisse. J. J. Wetsten. Proleg. ad N. T. Gr. p. 10. Si codex noster ab Acœmitâ scriptus est, uti diximus, non potest seculo quinto esse vetustior. Acœmitarum enim institutum auctorem habuit Marcellum Apamiensem, vel potius Alexandrum ejus successorem, qui floruit A. C. 420, teste Du Cange in glossario.—Existimo igitur, tempus, quo codex iste scriptus est, incidere in finem seculi quinti, quæ etiam Millii est sententia. Prol. 1338. Id. ib. 11.

[e] Prop. xiv. Nonnulla in se continet codex Alexandrinus, quæ ad ecclesiam Alexandrinam respiciunt. Veritas hujus assertionis probatur, 1. ex epistolâ Athanasii. 2. ex Hypothesibus Eusebii. 3. ex Canonibus Psalmorum. 4. ex Canticis annexis. 5. ex tertio Maccabæorum libro. 6. ex Psalmis Salomonis. 7. ex traditione ecclesiæ Alexandriæ. Prolegom. ad. Tom. 2. Septuag. ex edit. Grabe, sect. 47. &c.

[f] —— additâ schedâ, quâ brevem dicti codicis notitiam propriâ manu tradidit sequentibus verbis: 'Liber iste Scripturæ Sacræ, N. et. V. Testamenti, prout ex traditione habemus, est scriptus manu Theclæ, nobilis feminæ Ægyptiæ, ante mille et trecentos annos circiter, paulo post Concilium Nicænum. Nomen Theclæ in fine libri erat exaratum.—Extinctum ergo et est Theclæ nomen et laceratum. Sed memoria et traditio recens observat.' Apud Grabe, Prolegom. i. sect. 1.

[g] Psalmis Davidis præfixa sunt a p. 523. usque 533. Athanasii epistola ad Marcellinum de libro Psalmorum, Eusebii Hypotheses in Psalmos, &c. Grabe, Prolegom. ad Tom. i. sect. 2.

[h] Primo figura literarum est elegans et Alexandrina, J. J. Wetstein. Proleg. ad N. T. Gr. T. i. p. 11. in.

It seems to me, therefore, somewhat strange, that Dr. Grabe should have taken a great deal of pains to prove, that[i] this manuscript was written by Thecla, governess of a monastery of women at Seleucia, in Cappadocia, or thereabout.

I shall say nothing more about the manuscript itself. I now proceed to observe, upon the just transcribed catalogue of books of scripture contained in it.

3. It is a full catalogue of canonical books: for, in the Old Testament, are expressly mentioned Ruth and Esther; in the New, fourteen epistles of St. Paul, seven catholic epistles, and St. John's Revelation; as well as others, which were universally received.

4. Concerning the order of the books, about which a great deal may be seen in[k] Grabe, I observe these few particulars only. The twelve lesser prophets are here reckoned in a different order from that now common with us, agreeably to the Hebrews. And[l] from Jerom we learn that, in his time, these prophets were placed differently in the Hebrew Bibles, and the Version of the Seventy: the order of this manuscript is exactly the same which, he says, was then observed in the editions of the Septuagint Version. The order of St. Paul's epistles, as we learn from Grabe, is the same as ours; except that the epistle to the Hebrews is placed next after the two epistles to the Thessalonians. The order of the catholic epistles is the same with that now in use; the epistle of James, the two epistles of Peter, the three epistles of John, and the epistle of Jude. Moreover, it might be agreeable to some of my readers to compare this catalogue with that of the Festal epistle of Athanasius, formerly[m] transcribed by us at length: the two catalogues very much agree, from the beginning to the books of the Chronicles, inclusive; in both, the lesser prophets are placed before the four other; and in the Festal epistle, as well as here, the catholic epistles follow next after the Acts of the Apostles, and precede St. Paul's epistles; and St. Paul's epistles are there in the same order as here; finally, both

[i] Vid. Prolegom. in Tom. i. sect. 4.

[k] Prolegom. ad. Tom. i. sect. 3.

[l] Non idem ordo est duodecim prophetarum apud Septuaginta Interpretes, qui in Hebraïcâ veritate retinetur. Illi enim ponunt secundum Amos, tertium Michæam, quartum Joel, quintum Abdiam, sextum Jonam, septimum Naüm, octavum Abakuk, nonum Sophoniam, decimum Aggæum, undecimum Zachariam, duodecimum Malachiam. Hebræi autem post Osee, qui apud utrosque primus est, secundum legunt Joël, tertium Amos, quartum Abdiam, quintum Jonam, sextum Michæam, septimum Naüm, octavum Abakuk, nonum Sophoniam, decimum Aggæum, undecimum Zachariam, duodecimum, qui et ultimus est, Malachiam, Pr. Comment. in Joel. T. iii. p. 1335.

[m] See vol. iv. ch. lxxv.

have the Revelation. It may be also worth observing, that St. Paul's epistles have likewise the same order (that is, the epistle to the Hebrews is placed before those to Timothy, Titus, and Philemon) in[n] Euthalius, an Egyptian bishop, and well acquainted with Athanasius, who was bishop of Alexandria, about 490. The same order of Paul's epistles is in Cosmas of Alexandria; to be alleged hereafter.

5. This manuscript contains a great number of books, which are not now reckoned canonical. As I have often spoken of this matter in several places, a great deal needs not to be said here. But probably all the books here mentioned, and written out in these volumes, were not reckoned to be of equal authority: it may be supposed, that they were all read sometimes in the assemblies of christians, in the city or country, where this truly noble manuscript was written. Nevertheless, it would be unreasonable to think, that they were esteemed of authority, and decisive in any doctrines of religion; that would be contrary to the sentiments of ancient christian writers, in general; and particularly of[o] Athanasius in his Festal epistle, and of the[p] Synopsis, sometimes ascribed to him, and probably written by an Alexandrian.

NICEPHORUS.

II. In the next place I shall put down the Stichometry of Nicephorus, patriarch of Constantinople, who flourished in the beginning of the ninth century. Some have disputed the genuineness of this catalogue, Pearson[q] in particular; who supposeth it the work of an unknown person, though it be found subjoined to the Chronography of Nicephorus: but generally it is allowed. Cave says, if[r] it is not Nicephorus's, it must have been composed by some other Greek, about the same time; because it was translated into Latin by Anastasius Bibliothecarius, in Italy, who flourished about 870. Fabricius[s] thinks it to be Nicephorus's, or a more

[n] See in this vol. p. 71.

[o] See vol. iv. ch. lxxv.

[p] Id. ibid.

[q] At quomodo, quæso, Stichometria pars est Chronographiæ, quæ ab eâ toto cœlo distat? Assuta est illi quidem in Codicibus Græcis. Sed non magis ipsa pars est Chronographiæ, quam Chronographia pars est Stichometriæ. Vindic. Ignat. P. i. c. 4. p. 272. B.

[r] Auctoris tamen esse Nicephoro coævi vel inde patet, quod ab Anastasio Romano in linguam Latinam versa sit. H. L. T. ii. p. 5.

[s] Nicephori esse negat idem Pearsonius in vindiciis Ignatii. Et sane videtur Nicephoro antiquior esse. Libros enim recenset eodem ordine, quo in calce Synopseos Athanasianæ leguntur. Fabric. Cod. Apoc. N. T. p. 143. in notis.

ancient writer's: nor do I perceive [t] Mill to hesitate about its genuineness.

A Stichometry is a catalogue of books of sacred scripture; to which is added the number of the verses which each book contains. This Stichometry contains a catalogue of the books of the Old and New Testament: I propose to transcribe the whole, omitting only the numbers of verses, which are oftentimes faulty, and are not material at present. There are many editions[u] of this Stichometry, beside that[v] at the end of the Chronography of its supposed author. I shall follow the edition of Montfaucon, which[w] he has lately published, as more exact than most others; observing, perhaps, in some places, the different readings of some other editions.

'The[x] divine scriptures, which are received by the 'church, and reckoned canonical, and their Stichometry, are 'thus: Genesis; Exodus; Leviticus; Numbers; Deutero-'nomy; Joshua; Judges, and Ruth; the first and second 'book of the Kingdoms; the third and fourth book of the 'Kingdoms; the first and second of the Remains; Ezra, 'first and second; the[y] book of Psalms; the Proverbs of 'Solomon; Ecclesiastes; the Song of Songs; Job; Isaiah 'the prophet; Jeremiah the prophet; Baruch; Ezekiel; 'Daniel; the twelve prophets. All[z] together, the books of 'the Old Testament are 22.

'The[a] scriptures of the New Testament are these: the 'gospel according to Matthew, the gospel according to Mark, 'the gospel according to Luke, the gospel according to 'John; the Acts of the Apostles; fourteen epistles of Paul; 'seven Catholic epistles; one of James, two of Peter, three 'of John, one of Jude. All[b] together, the books of the New 'Testament are 26.

'The[c] contradicted are these: Three books of the Mac-'cabees; the Wisdom of Solomon; the Wisdom of Jesus, 'the son of Sirach; Psalms, and Odes of Solomon; Esther 'Judith; Susanna; Tobit, called also Tobias.

'The[d] contradicted books of the New Testament are 'these: Enoch; the Patriarchs; the Prayer of Joseph; the

Conf. Ejusd. Bib. Gr. T. xiii. p. 844.

[t] Vid. Prolegom. n. 1030, 1031.

[u] Vid. Fabric. et Mill. ubi supra.

[v] Apud Jos. Scalig. Thesaur. Temporum, p. 312.

[w] Vid. Bib. Coislin. p. 204, 205.

[x] *Και ὁσαι εισι θειαι γραφαι εκκλησιαζομεναι, και κεκανονισμεναι, και ἡ τατων στιχομετρια, ατως.* Ibid.

[y] *Βιβλος ψαλμων.*

[z] *Ὁμα της παλαιας διαθηκης βιβλια κβ'.*

[a] *Της νεας διαθηκης.*

[b] *Ὁμα της νεας διαθηκης βιβλια κς'.*

[c] *Και ὁσα αντιλεγονται, ταυτα εισιν.* Montf. *Και ὁσαι αντιλεγονται, αὐται εισι της παλαιας.* Scalig.

[d] *Και ὁσα της νεας αντιλεγονται.*

'Testament of Moses; the Assumption of Moses; Abra-
'ham; Eldad and Modad; Elias the prophet; Zephaniah
'the prophet; Zachary the father of John the Baptist;
'Baruch;[e] Habakkuk; Ezekiel; and Daniel, falsely in-
'scribed.

'Apocryphal[f] books of the New Testament are these:
'The[g] Circuits [or 'Itinerary'] of Peter, the Circuit of
'John, the Circuit of Thomas; the[h] Revelation of John;
'the Doctrine of the Apostles; Clement,[i] his first and se-
'cond [epistle]; Ignatius; Polycarp; the Shepherd, and
'Hermas.'

I shall now make a few remarks:

1. This catalogue is of use, to show that the Jewish canon was generally esteemed sacred by christians; and that the other books of the Old Testament, which are now often called 'apocryphal,' and here, 'contradicted,' were not of equal authority, though they were read sometimes in some churches, and often quoted by christian writers. Indeed, Baruch is here placed among the sacred scriptures of the Old Testament; and Esther among the contradicted. And it is well known, that the book of Esther was not in all ancient catalogues: the book of Baruch is the only thing in which this catalogue differs from that of the Jews: and the inserting that, and the omission of Esther, may be reckoned things of no great consequence.

2. This catalogue affords evidence, that there never were any christian writings esteemed to be of equal authority with those which are now received by us as sacred and canonical.

3. One book, now generally received by us, is not here numbered among the canonical, but among the apocryphal scriptures. Upon this, therefore, I observe, as follows, In the copy published by Scaliger, after[k] the Circuit of Thomas, is put the Gospel of Thomas, without any notice at all of the Revelation of John. In Montfaucon's copy, or manuscript, if I understand him, 'the Revelation of John' had been struck out, though he puts it in his printed edition. Of this point Montfaucon speaks distinctly in his preface to the Bibliotheca Coisliniana: He thinks 'that[l] the

[e] Βαρυχ, Αμβακυμ, Εζεκιηλ, και Δανιηλ ψευδεπιγραφα.

[f] Και ὁσα της νεας εισιν αποκρυφα. [g] Περιοδοι Πετρυ. Περιοδος Ιωαννυ. [h] Ἡ Αποκαλυψις Ιωαννυ. Hoc erasum fuit. Montf.

[i] Κλημεντος. A. B.
Ιγνατιυ, Πολυκαρπυ, Ποιμενος, και Ἑρμα.

[k] Περιοδος Ιωαννυ. Περιοδος Θωμα. Ευαγγελιον κατα Θωμαν. Scalig.

[l] Decimum septimum anecdoton est Canon Scripturæ Sacræ per Nicephorum Patriarcham C. P. quo editum erat, sed cum mendis perpetuis, ita ut in

'Revelation was put by Nicephorus among the canonical 'books: for, in his time, the Revelation was received by 'the christians at Constantinople: however, it is certain, 'that there have been different opinions about this book; 'possibly, therefore, some transcriber, agreeably to his 'opinion, struck it out of the article of canonical books, and 'put it among the apocryphal: another transcriber, after 'that, offended at seeing it among the apocryphal, struck it 'out; but yet did not replace it among the canonical, as he 'should.' So that learned writer.

4. It may deserve to be remarked, that 'Enoch, the 'Patriarchs, the Prayer of Joseph, the Testament of Moses, 'Abraham, Eldad,' and 'Modad, Elias,' and some other books of the like kind, are not placed here among the contradicted scriptures of the Old, but of the New Testament; which I think shows that these books were christian writings: by their titles they should belong to the Old Testament; nevertheless, they are reckoned among the contradicted books of the New Testament. Very probably, therefore, they were of old time, as well as of late, esteemed by many, christian forgeries.

5. It is somewhat strange, that the epistles of Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, and the book of Hermas, should be placed in a different class, below and after such books as had been mentioned in the foregoing article of 'contradict-'ed,' and also after such books as precede in this article of 'apocryphal.' Fabricius thinks, that[m] thereby are not to be understood the epistles, or genuine writings of those apostolical fathers; but their doctrines, or didascaliæ. And so, indeed, this part is expressed in the Stichometry, or Indiculus, prefixed by Cotelerius to the Apostolical Constitutions:

versiculorum numeris vix quidpiam sanum occurreret.—Inter apocryphos hoc in libello Apocalypsin numerari, non est quod mireris. Non enim defuere variis temporibus, qui hunc sacrum librum inter canonicos non admitterent, nec a Joanne apostolo editum putarent. Ego vero non existimo Apocalypsin a Nicephoro ad apocryphos ablegatam fuisse. Nam certum est, illius tempore ecclesiam Constantinopolitanam hunc librum inter canonicos admisisse. Sed quispiam fortasse postea in Nicephori Canone Apocalypsin temere ex canonicis expunxerit, et inter apocryphos locârit. Quæ causa fuisse videtur, ut alius deinceps Apocalypsin in hoc codice ex apocryphis abraderet. Qui tamen eam non inter canonicos reposuit, ut debuerat. Præf. p. 7.

[m] Cæterum ex eodem Cotelerii indiculo disertissime apparet in hac Nicephori στιχομετρίᾳ non rejici inter apocrypha epistolas Clementis—neque epistolas Ignatii, neque Polycarpi denique, a totâ antiquitate christianâ pro genuinis habitas, sed διδαχας, sive διδασκαλιας sub illorum nomine editas. Cod. Apocr. N. T. p. 144. in notis.

III. Which,[n] therefore, I shall now[o] also transcribe. It is intitled, 'Of[p] the sixty books, and those which are not of 'that number:' '1. Genesis; 2. Exodus; 3. Leviticus; 4. 'Numbers; 5. Deuteronomy; 6. Joshua; 7. Judges, and 'Ruth; 8. the first book of the Kingdoms; 9. the second 'book of the Kingdoms; 10. the third book of the King-'doms; 11. the fourth book of the Kingdoms; 12. the 'Remains, the fifth [that is, if numbered with those just 'mentioned;] 13. Job; 14. the Psalter; 15. the Proverbs; '16. the Ecclesiastes; 17. the Canticles, the fifth [that is, 'of the books written in verse or metre;] 18. Ezra; mean-'ing, probably, our Ezra and Nehemiah; 19. Hosea; 20. 'Amos; 21. Micah; 22. Joel; 23. Jonah; 24. Obadiah; '25. Nahum; 26. Habakkuk; 27. Zephaniah; 28. Haggai; '29. Zechariah; 30. Malachi; 31. Isaiah; 32. Jeremiah; '33. Ezekiel; 34. Daniel; 35. the Gospel according to 'Matthew, 36. according to Mark, 37. according to Luke, '38. according to John; 39. the Acts of the Apostles; 40. 'the Epistle of James; 41. of Peter, 42. of Peter; 43. of 'John, 44. of John, 45. of John; 46. of Jude; 47. of Paul 'to the Romans; 48. to the Corinthians; 49. to the Corin-'thians; 50. to the Galatians; 51. to the Ephesians; 52. 'to the Philippians; 53. to the Colossians; 54. to the 'Thessalonians, 55. to the Thessalonians; 56. to Timothy, '57. to Timothy; 58. to Titus; 59. to Philemon; 60. to the 'Hebrews.

'Those,[q] which are not of the number of the sixty, are, 'as follows: 1. the Wisdom of Solomon; 2. the Wisdom 'of Sirach; 3. Maccabees, 4. Maccabees, 5. Maccabees, 6. 'Maccabees; 7. Esther; 8. Judith; 9. Tobit.

'Such[r] as are apocryphal: 1. Adam; 2. Enoch; 3. La-'mech; 4. the Patriarchs; 5. the Prayer of Joseph; 6. 'Eldam and Modam; 7. the Testament of Moses; [Here is 'a void space in the MSS. where, probably, was, or should 'have been, the Assumption of Moses;] 9. Psalms of Solo-'mon; 10. the Revelation of Elias; 11. the Revelation of 'Isaiah; 12. the Revelation of Zephaniah; 13. the Revela-'tion of Zachary; 14. the Revelation of Ezra; 15. the[s] 'History of Jacob [or James;] 16. the Revelation of Peter;

[n] Indiculus ille etiam subjungitur Anastasii Quæstionibus in Codice, 1789. Bibliothecæ Christianissimi Regis. Ita vero se habet. Coteler. Judic. De Constitut. Apostol. [o] Indiculus MS. Cod. Baroc. 206. Qui etiam, a Cotelerio ex Cod. Reg. Paris. 1789, editus est. De lx. libris, et quinam extra illos sint. Humf. Hod. De Bib. Text. Orig. l. iv. p. 649. Col. 44. [p] Περι των ξ' βιβλιων, και ὁσα τουτων εκτος.

[q] Και ὁσα εξω των ξ'. [r] Και ὁσα αποκρυφα.

[s] Ιακωβ ἱστορια.

'17.[t] the Circuits and Doctrines of the Apostles; 18. the 'Epistle of Barnabas; 19. the Acts of Paul; 20. the Revelation of Paul; 21.[u] the Doctrine of Clement; 22. the 'Doctrine of Ignatius; 23. the Doctrine of Polycarp; 24.[v] 'the Gospel according to Barnabas; 25. the Gospel according to Matthew.'

Upon this catalogue we may make a few remarks, omitting minute particulars; as the order of the books, and other like things.

1. This catalogue, as well as the foregoing, tends to satisfy us, that a superior regard was always shown, by christians in general, to the books of the Jewish canon; for the Old Testament, above all other books, written before or after the coming of Christ, which were not of that number; and that there were no other books received as a part of the canon of the New Testament, beside those which are now generally received by us.

2. The books of this catalogue are of three sorts: first, 'the sixty,' of the highest authority; secondly, 'those 'without,' might be also called 'contradicted,' and probably were reckoned useful, and allowed to be sometimes publicly read in the assemblies of christians; thirdly, books called 'apocryphal,' to which was paid a less regard than to the former.

3. With regard to the books of the Old Testament, we cannot but observe, that among the 'sixty' are placed three books only, which we call Solomon's; the Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Canticles: the other two, sometimes ascribed to him, Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus, are placed with those, which were not of the sixty. Again: among the sixty is but one book of Ezra, probably meaning our Ezra and Nehemiah; nor is there here any mention at all of any other historical books of Ezra: but among the apocryphal is a book called the Revelation of Ezra. Once more: the book of Esther is not here placed among the (sixty;) but among those which were 'without' the number, only as an useful book.

4. With regard to the books of the New Testament; here are none, beside those, now received by us, as was observed before. But here are not all which we receive; the book of the Revelation is quite omitted; what shall we say to this? It seems to me, that it was not received by the composer of this catalogue; for then it would have been among

[t] Περιοδοι και διδαχαι των αποστολων. μεντος.—Ιγνατιε διδασκαλια. λε. Ευαγγελιον κατα Ματθαιον.

[u] Διδασκαλια Κλη-

[v] Ευαγγελιον κατα Βαρναβα.

the sixty. But still it will be asked, How shall we account for the total omission of it? To which I answer, It may be accounted for one of these two ways. Either the author quite omitted it, thinking it better so to do, and be quite silent, than to put it in any class out of the sixty, which would have been offensive to some: or else the author himself did at first place it among some of the books, without the sixty; and some transcriber afterwards struck it out, not enduring to see it debased by an improper situation.

5. Among apocryphal books, and the very last of them, is 'the Gospel according to Matthew;' concerning which little or nothing beside conjectures can be said; but thereby cannot be meant our gospel of Matthew, which is among the sixty: possibly this article has been, by some means or other, curtailed. The gospel according to the Hebrews may have been here mentioned, and said to have been esteemed by some the original, by others a translation of the gospel according to Matthew.

IV. I shall take no farther notice of Stichometries, except adding, that there is another published by Cotelerius[w] in his Judgment upon the epistle of Barnabas: he says, it is mutilated and corrupted. I put down that part which relates to the New Testament, and is thus: 'The four gospels; Matthew, Mark, Luke, John; the epistle of Paul to the Romans, the first to the Corinthians, the second to the Corinthians, to the Galatians, to the Ephesians, the first to Timothy, the second to Timothy, to Titus, to the Colossians, to Philemon; the first of Peter, the second of Peter; the epistle of James; the first of John, the second of John, the third of John; the epistle of Jude; the epistle of Barnabas; the Revelation of John; the Acts of the Apostles; the Shepherd; the Acts of Paul; the Revelation of Peter.'

Every one perceives, that this Catalogue is much mutilated, there being wanting several books, which were always universally received; as the epistle to the Philippians, and the two epistles to the Thessalonians; as well as the epistle to the Hebrews, which also was generally received: and it may be reckoned probable, that all these were originally in this catalogue, or Stichometry. What use can be made of the latter part of the catalogue, I must refer to every reader's own consideration.

[w] Vid. Patr. Apost. Tom. i.

CHAP. CXLVIII.

COSMAS OF ALEXANDRIA.

I. *His time, and works.* II. *Scriptures of the Old Testament received by him.* III. *Books of the New Testament received by him.* IV. *General titles and divisions of the books of scripture, and marks of respect for them.* V. *Two general observations concerning the canon of scripture.* VI. *Select passages.*

I. COSMAS, of Alexandria in Egypt, called Indopleustes, or Indicopleustes, on account of a voyage which he made to the Indies; at first a merchant, afterwards monk and author, lived in the time of the emperor Justinian, and is computed to have flourished[a] about the year 535. He wrote several things, particularly the[b] Christian Topography, or the Opinion of Christians concerning the World, in twelve books, still extant, and some while ago published to great advantage by Dom Bernard de Montfaucon. In that work, Cosmas, contrary to the sentiment of all astronomers in general, denies the earth to be spherical; and endeavours to prove his opinion from reason, scripture, and christian writers, who lived before him.

I cannot avoid taking notice of this writer, his testimony to the scriptures being very considerable; and if I do not confine myself to that, I shall, nevertheless, for the sake of brevity, omit divers things, not unworthy of observation; for, as Montfaucon says, the[c] digressions are as valuable as the work itself.

II. 1. And, in the first place, I observe, that Cosmas's canon of the Old Testament was that of the Jews: he has once quoted[d] Baruch, scribe or secretary of the prophet Jeremiah; [e] Ecclesiasticus; and [f] the Maccabees; but not as of authority. The books quoted by him, as of authority, and expressly mentioned,[g] are the Pentateuch; the book of

[a] Vid. Cav. H. L. T. i. p. 515. et Montf. Præf. in Cosm. Topogr. cap. i.

[b] Cosmæ Indicopleustæ Christianorum Opinio de Mundo, sive Topographia Christiana. Ap. B. Montf. Nov. Collection. PP. T. ii. p. 113, &c. Paris. 1706.

[c] Ut vero digressionibus gaudet scriptor noster, multa præclara ultro citroque refert. Vereque dici potest, esse το παρεργον κρειττον τε εργε. Præf. ib. cap. ii. fin.

[d] Topogr. Chr. l. ii. p. 137.

[e] L. iii. p. 382. D

[f] L. ii. p. 145. C.

[g] L. v. p. 238, 239.

Joshua; the Judges; Ruth; the book of the Kings, and the Chronicles; the book of Psalms; three books of Solomon, the Proverbs, Canticles, and Ecclesiastes; the twelve prophets; and the four larger prophets. Here is no particular mention of Ezra: but[h] that book is elsewhere expressly quoted, with the Chronicles.

2. In another place, having mentioned the historical facts of the Old Testament, to the settlement of the Israelites in the land of Canaan, he says: 'After[i] that, God raised up to them prophets; David the king, Samuel, the great Elias, and his disciple Elisha; and the twelve; and the four greater prophets, who prophesied of the coming of the Lord Christ.'

3. The[k] book of Job is quoted several times, and as divine scripture.

4. The[l] Psalms are often quoted, and called divine scripture. David is styled by him,[m] the 'great David,' king and prophet; and he says, that[n] the book of Psalms was composed by him.

5. The book of Ecclesiastes is quoted by him with marks of the highest respect: 'As,[o] the divine scripture says; by 'the divine Solomon.' In another place, he seems to diminish Solomon, saying, 'that he[p] wrote the Proverbs, the Songs, and the Ecclesiastes; having received from God the grace of wisdom to instruct men in the right conduct of life: but he did not receive the grace of prophecy.' Nevertheless, I suppose that Cosmas does not deny Solomon the gift of inspiration; but only the gift of prophecy, or foretelling things to come: in the general sense of the word, therefore, he was a prophet, being moved by the Holy Ghost.

6. Having collected testimonies out of the twelve prophets, and last of all out of Malachi, he[q] proceeds immediately to the New Testament.

7. And he says, that[r] the books of the Old Testament were written in Hebrew.

III. The books of the New Testament, received by Cosmas, are, the four gospels, the Acts, St. Paul's fourteen epistles, and some of the catholic epistles.

1. In the fifth book, where he quotes the books of scrip-

[h] Ἐτι δε και ἡ προταξις Κυρε εγγραφως εν ταις Παραλιπομεναις, και εν τῳ Εσδρᾳ τεταγμενη. L. viii. p. 306. A.
[i] L. v. p. 207. E.
[k] L. ii. p. 128. A. L. iii. p. 167. D. et passim.
[l] L. ii. p. 158. B.
[m] L. v. p. 224. B.
[n] L. v. p. 238. D.
[o] L. ii. p. 134. B.
[p] L. v. p. 139. E.
[q] Vid. l. v. p. 237—241.
[r] L. vii. p. 275. D.

ture one after another, and gives some account of each book, he says: 'Matthew[s] is the first evangelist who wrote a gospel. There being a persecution, when Stephen was stoned, and he also being about to go from that place, the believers entreated him to leave with them a written instruction, with which request he complied: and, being well acquainted, especially with the abode of the Lord in flesh here on this earth, he set before them a pattern of an excellent institution, and of an heavenly and divine life and conversation:' and what follows.

2. 'Mark,[t] the second evangelist, wrote a gospel at Rome, by the direction of Peter.'

3. 'Luke[u] is the third evangelist, who, having observed many endeavouring to write gospels, and inventing things out of their own heads, wrote to his own disciple Theophilus, to guard him against such accounts.' And here Cosmas likewise mentions the Acts; in which as well as in his gospel, he says, Luke gives an account of our Lord's ascension into heaven.

4. I would observe here, that,[v] from several places of this work, it appears, this author had in his copies, the first and second chapters of St. Matthew's gospel, and the history of our Lord's nativity, as recorded by St. Luke.

5. 'The[w] fourth and chief of the evangelists is John the divine: who was more beloved by Christ than all the rest, who leaned upon the Lord's breast, and from thence, as from an overflowing fountain, drew mysteries: to whom, when he dwelt at Ephesus, were delivered by the faithful the writings of the other evangelists. Receiving them, he said, that what they had written was well written; but some things were omitted by them, which were needful to be related. And being desired by the faithful, he also published his writing, as a kind of supplement to the rest, containing such things as these: the wedding at Cana; the history of Nicodemus; the woman of Samaria; the nobleman [or courtier, John iv. 46—54]; the man blind from his birth; Lazarus; the indignation of Judas at the woman that anointed the Lord with ointment; the Greeks that came to Jesus; his washing his disciples' feet; and suitable instructions upon several occasions; and the promise of the Comforter; and concerning the deity of Christ, expressly and

[s] Οὗτος πρωτος των ευαγγελιστων συγγραψαμενος ευαγγελιον, κ. λ. L. v. p. 245. [t] —— Πετρῳ εν Ῥωμῃ εντειλαμενῳ αυτῳ. p. 246. D.

[u] P. 247. A. C. [v] Vid. l. iii. p. 147. A. p. 176. E. l. v. p. 245. C. D. E. p. 247. et passim.

[w] Οὗτος ὁ θεολογος Ιωαννης, ὁ εξαρχος των ευαγγελιστων. p. 248.

clearly at the beginning, and promising that as the foundation of his work: all which things had been omitted by the rest.'

6. In[x] the next place are large quotations of discourses of Peter, recorded in the Acts of the Apostles.

7. 'Afterwards follows the[y] great apostle Paul, the great master of the church, and leader of the heavenly band, who had Christ speaking in him: of whose fourteen epistles Cosmas says, it[z] is not needful for him to allege all the places that are to his purpose. However,[a] he gives a general account of them, and in this order: to the Romans; to the Corinthians; to the Galatians; to the Ephesians; Philippians; Colossians; Thessalonians; Hebrews; Timothy; Titus; Philemon.' He says, 'the[b] epistle to the Hebrews was written in Hebrew; and was translated into Greek, as is said, by Luke, or Clement. In like manner the gospel of Matthew,' that is, as I understand him, was written in Hebrew; for I do not judge it necessary to suppose, that Cosmas intended to intimate, that St. Matthew's gospel had the same translators as the epistle to the Hebrews; or to say any thing at all about the authors of that translation: but only that Matthew's gospel was written in Hebrew, in like manner as Paul's epistle to the Hebrews.

8. He says, in another place, the[c] epistle to the Hebrews was written to the Jews who believed in Christ.

9. Cosmas takes but little notice of the catholic epistles, except it be to answer objections, which were brought thence against some of his assertions. And in one place he says expressly: 'I[d] forbear to allege arguments from the catholic epistles; because, from ancient time, the church has looked upon them as of doubtful authority. And of all who have written Commentaries upon the divine scriptures, not one has taken notice of the catholic epistles: and all who have given an account of the canonical books of divine scripture, have spoken of them as doubtful; particularly Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, a man of great note, and eminent piety, who lived not long after the apostles; and Eusebius Pamphili; and Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria: and Amphilochius, bishop of Iconium, friend of the blessed Basil, in his Iambics to Seleucus, expressly declares them

[x] P. 249—251. [y] P. 251—253. [z] P. 253. C.
[a] P. 254, 255. [b] P. 255. C.
[c] Ὁ δε αποστολος Παυλος προς τους εκ των Ἑβραιων πεπιστευκοτας εις Χριστον γεγραφηκεν, κ. λ. L. vii. p. 279. D. [d] Σιωπωμεν δε ὁτι τας καθολικας ανεκαθεν ἡ εκκλησια αμφιβαλλομενας εχει, κ. λ. L. vii. p. 292. B. E.

doubtful. In like manner Severian, bishop of Gabala, in his book against the Jews, rejects them; forasmuch as most men say, they are not writings of apostles, but of some others, who were elders only. And, agreeably hereto, Eusebius Pamphili in his Ecclesiastical History says, that at Ephesus are two monuments, one of John the evangelist, and another of John an elder, who wrote two of the catholic epistles; even the second and third, inscribed after this manner: "the Elder to the elect Lady; and the Elder to the beloved Gaius:" and both he and Irenæus say, that but two are written by apostles, even the first of Peter, and the first of John: and some say, that neither are they written by apostles, but by elders only. They argue in this manner: The epistles of John are numbered, the first, second, and third; as being all three written by one and the same person. Others receive the epistle of James, together with those two [that is, the first of Peter, and the first of John]. Among the Syrians are found only the three before mentioned; I mean, the epistle of James, the epistle of Peter, and the epistle of John: they have not the rest. Upon[e] the whole, it does not become a perfect christian, to endeavour to confirm any thing by doubtful books; when the books in the Testament acknowledged by all, have sufficiently declared all things needful to be known, concerning the heavens, and the earth, and the elements, and the whole christian doctrine.'

Upon this passage of Cosmas, many remarks might be made; I shall mention these following:

(1.) His expressions are in some places ambiguous, and therefore obscure: it is not always certain, whether he intends to be understood of all the catholic epistles in general, or of some only.

(2.) Cosmas betrays an inclination to represent all the catholic epistles as doubtful, and to diminish their authority:

(3.) But that is unreasonable: all ancient christians, in general, received one epistle of Peter, and one epistle of John.

(4.) Cosmas says, that not one of the ancient commentators of sacred scripture had written a Commentary upon the catholic epistles: which,[f] as Montfaucon observes, is not

[e] Ου χρη ουν τον τελειον χριστιανον εκ των αμφιβαλλομενων επιστηριζεσθαι, των ενδιαθετων και κοινως ὁμολογεμενων γραφων ικανως παντα μηνυοντων περι τε των ὡρανων και της γης, και των στοιχειων, και παντος τυ δογματος των χριστιανων. Ibid. p. 292. E.

[f] Hic sane Cosmas non accurate rem agit.—Didymus enim Alexandrinus

rightly said; for Didymus of Alexandria wrote Commentaries upon all the seven catholic epistles.

(5.) It is not needful for us now to consider the accounts here given of the sentiment of Irenæus, Eusebius, Athanasius, Amphilochius and others; or to examine whether these accounts be right or not: forasmuch as their testimony to the sacred scripture has been already observed, in their several chapters.

(6.) The seven catholic epistles were all well known in Egypt, where Cosmas lived, and were all received by many. So much is manifest from himself.

(7.) The christians in Syria received three only of the catholic epistles. Of this Cosmas speaks positively: it may be supposed, therefore, that it is a thing about which he was well assured, and for the truth of which he may be relied upon. So thought[g] Montfauçon and[h] Beausobre.

(8.) Though Cosmas was shy of quoting the catholic epistles, because, from[i] the second epistle of Peter a strong objection was brought against one of his opinions; yet I think, he must have received three of them; the epistle of James, the first of Peter, and the first of John; for, to the epistle of James he has a respectful reference in the introduction to his work, which is to this purpose: 'In[k] the name of the one God—from whom descends to us, from above, every good and perfect gift.' See James i. 17. And[l] he quotes the conclusion of the first epistle of Peter, the church, "which is at Babylon, saluteth you," as a proof of the early progress of the christian religion, without the bounds of the Roman empire; by which, therefore, we perceive, that by Babylon he did not understand Rome. He has also quoted[m] 1 Pet. i. 12.

(9.) We here see plainly expressed, that opinion of the ancient christians, that no book, doctrinal or epistolary,

integros in septem illas epistolas Commentarios edidit, teste Hieronymo. Præf. in Cosm. Topogr. p. 17.

[g] Secundam item Petri, et epistolam Judæ apostoli, perinde atque secundam et tertiam Joannis, a Syris, atque adeo ab Antiochenis, non admissas fuisse, diserte docet Cosmas Ægyptius, qui tempore Justiniani Imperatoris scribebat. Sic autem habet, p. 292.—Hinc manifeste vides, etiam tempore Justiniani Imperatoris, ex catholicis illis epistolis non nisi tres apud Syros, atque adeo in ecclesiâ Antiochenâ, receptas fuisse. Montf. Diatrib. in Synops. S. S. ap Chrys. T. 6. p. 309. [h] Cet auteur, qui étoit Egyptien, et qui florissoit dans le vi. siècle, assure que les Syriens n'ont que la 1. epitre de S. Jean. la 1. de Pierre, et celle de Jaques: qu' à l' égard des quatre autres, elles ne se trouvent pas même dans leurs églises. Hist. de Manich. T. i. p. 295. [i] *Ὁμοιως και εν ταις καθολικαις το ειρημενον, εν ῃ κρανοι πυρωμενοι λυθησονται,* κ. λ. [2 Pet. iii. 12.] L. vii. p. 290. E. Conf. p. 291. E.

[k] L. 113. A. [l] L. ii. p. 147. E. [m] L. vii. p. 289. A.

ought to be received as of authority, unless written by an apostle, and known to be so. All the catholic epistles bore the names of apostles: but whilst it was doubtful, with regard to several of them, whether they were written by apostles, so long they were of doubtful authority.

(10.) Lastly, we cannot omit to observe what is said at the end of this passage: that 'no perfect' or well instructed 'christian, should endeavour to prove any thing, but by the canonical books of scripture, acknowledged by all; which books have sufficiently declared whatever is needful to be known concerning the doctrines of religion.' A very valuable testimony to the sufficiency of scripture; and agreeable to the sentiments of all ancient christians, in general, as we have seen!

10. Hitherto we have seen nothing concerning the book of the Revelation; nor do I remember that there is any notice taken of it in this remaining work of Cosmas; and as it is a work of some length, and much is there said about the scriptures of the Old and New Testament, the entire omission of this book must be an argument, that it was not received by him. But whether the Revelation was received by Cosmas, or not, it is very likely that it was received by many christians in Egypt.

11. These then, as at first said, are the books of the New Testament, received by Cosmas: the four gospels; the Acts of the Apostles; fourteen epistles of the apostle Paul, and three catholic epistles; the epistle of James; one epistle of the apostle Peter; and one epistle of the apostle John.

IV. I would willingly observe the general titles and divisions of the books of sacred scripture, and the tokens of high respect for them, manifest in this writer.

1. 'This[n] is the design of all the divinely inspired scripture, both of the Old and the New Testament.'

2. 'Moses[o] and the prophets, Christ and his disciples, the evangelists and apostles, say nothing else.'

3. 'You[p] should observe the harmony of Moses, and all the prophets; and of the evangelists, and apostles.'

4. 'Moses[q] and the prophets said nothing of themselves, but only as inspired by divine revelation.' Some may think that our author had here an eye to 2 Pet. i. 21.

[n] *Οὗτος ὁ σκοπος πασης της θεοπνευστȣ γραφης, παλαιας τε και καινης διαθηκης.* L. v. p. 208. B. [o] *Ὁ κοσμογραφος τοινυν Μωϋσης, και οἱ λοιποι παντες προφηται—αλλα και ὁ κυριος παραγεγονως, και οἱ τȣτȣ μαθηται, ευαγγελιστai και αποστολοι, ουδεν ἑτερον ανεκηρυξαν.* L. v. p. 243. A.

[p] L. v. p. 255. D. [q] —— *αλλ' εκ θειας αποκαλυψεως εμπνευσθεντες.* L. i. p. 115. B.

5. In some places already mentioned, and in many others,[r] the whole of the New Testament is comprehended in the expression of evangelists and apostles.

6. He[s] relies, he says, entirely, upon the truly divine scripture for what he advances.

7. 'Moses[t] and the prophets, the Lord Christ, and the apostles.'

8. 'Blessed[u] therefore are all they, who, by the divine scriptures of the Old and New Testament, know the one God, Creator of all.'

V. I would now mention two observations:

1. The canon of the New Testament had not been settled in the time of this writer, by any authority that was decisive and universally acknowledged. The long passage concerning the catholic epistles, which we have seen, seems to afford full proof of this: for determining the regard due to those epistles, he appeals to the testimony of the church in early times, the commentators upon scripture, and divers ancient writers; and, in the end, mentions different opinions about them in his own time, and speaks of those epistles, or several of them, as of doubtful authority, whilst other parts of scripture were universally acknowledged; all which tends to show, that the canon of the scriptures of the New Testament had not been settled, and decided by any authority in which all acquiesced. But christian people were at liberty to judge for themselves, concerning the genuineness of writings proposed to them as apostolical; and to determine according to evidence.

2. I think that the work of this learned man, who had travelled, and seen divers parts of the world, and had also read, and was acquainted with the writings of ancient christians, affords a good argument, there never were any books of authority with christians, beside those books of the Old and New Testament which are now received by us: and as, in the Old Testament, the writers are prophets; so, in the New, the writers are apostles and evangelists. This appears from his quotations, and from the titles and divisions of scripture just transcribed: moreover, after having supported his opinions, as he was able, by the writings of the prophets and apostles, for farther satisfaction, he alleges passages of divers writers who had lived before him. Some, it seems, after publication of the former part of this work, in which are so many quotations of the

[r] L. i. p. 115. E. L. v. 245. A.

[s] L. i. p. 115. E. Vid. et p. 116. A. E. Χριστον και τας αποστολας. L. i. p. 117. A.

[t] —— τον δε δεσποτην

[u] L. vi. p. 271. E.

several parts of canonical scripture, said, that[v] his interpretations of scripture were different from those of our fathers, who might be reasonably supposed to have understood the true meaning of scripture. Well, what authors does he now allege? Does he produce passages of Hermas, Clement, Ignatius, the Recognitions, the Clementines, the Constitutions, the Acts or Preaching of Paul, or Peter, or Matthias, or any other like writings? No: his[w] first author is Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria; and, after that, Gregory Nazianzen, and some others; which, I think, must be allowed to be a good argument, that the writings of early christians, after the apostles, never were of authority. Cosmas alleges none of them; nor did they, who made exceptions to the first edition of his work, expect such citations from him; for he makes no apology for taking no notice of them; but immediately proceeds to writers of the fourth century, whose works never could make any pretensions to be a part of the rule of faith. So now in a like case, a writer of the present time, after proofs from the Old and the New Testament, might for the satisfaction of some objectors, quote Stillingfleet, and Tillotson, and Burnet, or Owen, and Baxter, and Manton.

VI. I shall add a few select passages:

1. He says, that[x] all Christ's miracles were suited to his excellent and gracious doctrine, being healing and beneficial. If any should object the loss of the swine, and the fig-tree; those miracles were not wrought on men, but only on brutes and a vegetable plant. He afterwards considers also the action of Christ's driving the buyers and sellers out of the temple; and says, that even then Christ did not strike any man with the whip which he had in his hand, but the brute animals only.

2. Cosmas speaks very agreeably of the progress of the christian religion: he observes, that[y] the gospel was first preached by the apostles with great success, in the Roman empire; soon after that it was preached in Persia, by the apostle Thaddeus. Accordingly, it is written in the catholic epistles: 'The church, which is at Babylon, elected together with you, saluteth you.' In another place he[z] enlarges upon the wonderful progress of the christian religion, as agreeable to what Christ had foretold. [John xvi. 33; Matth. xvi. 18; xiii. 33; xxiv. 14.] 'For,' says he,

[v] L. 10. p. 315. C. D.

[w] Παριτω δε εις μεσον πρωτος ὁ μεγας Αθανασιος, τα αυτα ἡμιν κρυττων. Ibid. E.

[x] L. iii. p. 164, 165.

[y] L. ii. p. 147. E. 148. A.

[z] L. iii. p. 178. C. D. E. et p. 179.

'though from the beginning christians were persecuted by the Greeks and Jews, they overcame, and drew over their enemies to themselves: accordingly, we see, the church has not been destroyed, but still subsisting and multiplied; and the whole earth is filled, and still more and more filling, with the doctrine of the Lord Christ, and the gospel preached in all the world; which,[z] says he, I myself have seen in many places, and therefore can bear witness to the truth of it.' Here he mentions a great many countries, remote from each other, where the gospel had been planted; and particularly several places in the Indies, where he had been, in which were many churches. He expressly says, that in Persia were many churches and bishops, and people, and many martyrs; as also in Ethiopia and Arabia.

CHAP. CXLIX.

FACUNDUS, BISHOP OF HERMIANA IN AFRICA.

1. FACUNDUS,[a] a learned African Bishop, flourished about the year of Christ 540.

2. I need not take notice of quotations of the gospels, and Acts, and other books of the New Testament, which were always received by all christians in general, in every part of the world.

3. He quotes[b] the epistle to the Hebrews, as the apostle Paul's.

4. He likewise quotes[c] the epistle of the apostle James, and[d] the second epistle of the apostle Peter, and[e] the

[z] Ib. p. 179. E. [a] Vid. Cav. H. L. Du Pin, Bib. T. v. p. 75. Fabric. Bib. Ec. ad Isidor. de Scr. Ec. c. 18, et 19.

[b] Sic etiam, cum Paulus ejus [Petri] coapostolus christianis omnibus legitur, dicens: 'Obedite præpositis vestris.' [Heb. xiii. 17.] Facund. l. xii. c. 3. p. 195. C. Paris. 1679. ad Hebræos dicit apostolus. L. iii. c. 6. p. 47. D. et alibi. [c] Jacobus apostolus dicit: 'Nolite plures magistri fieri.' [Cap. iii. 1.] L. x. c. 2. p. 151. C. Vid. et l. vi. c. 5. p. 93. C.

[d] Attendant, quod Petrus apostolus dicat: 'Dilectissimus frater noster Paulus, secundum eam, quæ data est illi, sapientiam, scripsit vobis.' [2 Pet. iii. 15, 16.] L. xii. c. 2. p. 187. D. [e] Quem Spiritum illi non habent, qui se ab ecclesiâ segregant, apostolo Judâ dicente: 'Hi sunt qui segregant semetipsos, animales, Spiritum non habentes.' [ver. 19.] l. xii. c. 1. p. 186. B.

epistle of the apostle Jude, and also[f] the book of the Revelation.

5. It is likely, therefore, that he received all the books of the New Testament, which we do, and no other.

6. His general division of the books of the New Testament is, that[g] of gospels and apostles: for all which he has the greatest[h] regard.

7. He quotes[i] the epistle to the Ephesians with that title.

8. He cites Tit. ii. 13. after this manner: 'Looking[k] for the blessed hope, and the appearing of the glory of the great God, our Saviour Jesus Christ.'

9. Facundus, citing the fifth chapter of the first epistle of St. John, does not mention the heavenly witnesses, but says, that[l] 'the spirit' denotes the Father, 'the water' the Holy Spirit, and 'the blood' Jesus Christ.

[f] L. ii. c. 5. p. 30. 'A. et passim.'

[g] Evangelicæ et apostolicæ de Domino voces. L. i. c. 5. p. 17. B.

[h] Hanc autem reverentiam ipsi divinæ scripturæ deferimus, ut non credamus quod aliquid indigne laudavit. Et ideo cum audiamus apostolum inter alios justos Samson quoque laudantem, atque dicentem [Heb. xi. 32.] intelligimus, quod—l. xii. c. 1. p. 186. D.

[i] Audiant apostolum scribentem Ephesiis, l. iii. c. 6. p. 48. C.

[k] —— expectantes beatem spem, et adventum gloriæ magni Dei salvatoris nostri Jesu Christi. l. i. c. 1. p. 3.

[l] Nam et Johannes in epistolâ suâ de Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto sic dicit: 'Tres sunt, qui testimonium dant in terrâ, spiritus, aqua, et sanguis; et hi tres unum sunt;' in 'Spiritu' significans Patrem, sicut Dominus mulieri Samaritanæ, secundum ipsius Johannis Evangelium, loquitur, dicens. [Joh. iv. 21—24.] In 'aquâ' vero Spiritum Sanctum significans, sicut in eodem suo evangelio exposuit verba Domini. [cap. vii. 37—39.] In 'sanguine' vero Filium significans, quoniam ipse ex Sanctâ Trinitate communicavit, carni et sanguini. L. i. c. 3. p. 7. C.

Nam si ecclesia Christi—tres credidit et prædicavit, Patrem, et Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum, sicut testimonio Johannis supra docuimus quo, dictum est. 'Tres sunt, qui testimonium dant in terrâ, spiritus, aqua, et sanguis; et hi tres unum sunt.' Ib. p. 8. C. D.

CHAP. CL.

ARETHAS.

1. 'ARETHAS,' says[a] Du Pin, 'who wrote a Commentary 'upon the Revelation, extracted from that of Andrew of 'Cæsarea, is placed in the sixth century, and reckoned to 'have been bishop of Cæsarea; but there is no proof, 'either of the one, nor the other.'

2. By Cave[b] Arethas is placed at the year 540. And he is somewhat displeased with Casimire Oudin, for supposing him to have lived much later, about the year 920. Nevertheless[c] Fabricius favours Oudin's conjecture, that Arethas was a writer of the tenth century; however, he calls his Commentary upon the Apocalypse an excellent work.

3. Mill[d] speaks of him, together with other writers, of the sixth century, about 540, and calls his work a chain, collected out of the Commentary of his predecessor Andrew, and the works of Irenæus, Hippolytus, Gregory Nazianzen, Cyril of Alexandria, and others.

4. Arethas, at the beginning of his Commentary, upon ch. i. ver. 1, 3, says, 'That[e] some of the ancients looked upon this book as spurious, and because it differed from the style of the beloved disciple in his other writings, ascribed it to another. But Gregory, called also the divine, reckons it among the genuine writings of the evangelist: and in the[f]

[a] Bib. des Aut. Ec. Tom. v. p. 74.

[b] Arethas, Cæsareæ Cappadociæ Archiepiscopus, claruit, uti vult Coccius, et post eum alii (qui tamen incertis prorsus nituntur conjecturis) circa annum 540. Longe vero recentior, si modo verum sit, quod vult Casimirus Oudin, eundem scilicet fuisse nostrum cum Arethâ, presbytero Cæsariensi, qui circa annum 920, scripsit Translationem Euthymii Patriarchæ, C. P. apud Lippomanum Tomo 3 repertam. Verum id gratis affirmat Oudinus. Nec enim præsto ei est argumentum, quo sententiam suam confirmet. Cav. H. T. i. p. 520.

[c] Arethas, qui et ipse post Andream Cæsareæ ejusdem in Cappadociâ Archiepiscopus fuisse traditur, forte haud diversus est ab Arethâ, qui adhuc presbyter Cæsariensis scripsit de translatione Euthymii C. P. A. C. 911. defuncti. Neque improbabilis hæc mihi videtur C. V. Casimiri Oudini conjectura—ejus insigne in Apocalypsin opus prodiit, &c. Bib. Gr. T. vii. p. 791, 792.

[d] Proleg. n. 1007.

[e] *Τινες των αρχαιοτερων νοθευεσι ταυτην της Ιωαννε τε ηγαπημενε γλωττης, ἑτερῳ ταυτην ανατιθεντες. Ουκ εστι δε ετως. Ὁ γαρ συνεπωνυμος τετῳ Γρηγοριος ανεκρινε ταυτην τοις ανοθευτοις· ως ἡ Ιωαννε, φησας, διδασκει με Αποκαλυψις.* Areth. Comm. in Apocalyps. p. 645. B. ad calcem. Comment. Oecumen. T. 2.

[f] Procem. ib. p. 640. B.

preface, agreeably to what had been before written by Andrew, he says, it had been received as inspired scripture by Basil, Gregory, Cyril [of Alexandria,] Papias, Irenæus, and Hippolytus, orthodox fathers; and, therefore, it ought to be received in a like manner by us.'

5. Possibly, some may think, that the writers here named, afford an argument, that Arethas did not live later than the sixth century.

6. I would briefly observe, that in this work are quoted most or all the books of the New Testament, particularly the[g] gospel of Mark, and the[h] Acts, written by Luke; the epistle to the Hebrews[i] as Paul's, expressly, and[k] often; the[l] epistle of James, and[m] the second of Peter: he received all the three epistles of John; for he often quotes the first, and once in this manner: John[n] in the first of his catholic epistles. It is likely, therefore, that he received all the same books of the New Testament that we do; nor have I observed any marks of peculiar respect for any other christian writings; and may I add here, though somewhat out of place, that[o] this writer quotes Solomon's Song.

7. Upon Rev. i. 5, "Unto him who loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood," he says, that was[p] written two ways, in some copies 'washed,' in others 'delivered' or 'redeemed.' Mill[q] has taken notice of this place, and prefers the latter reading.

[g] Vid. not. [h].

[h] *Λεκας γαρ εν ταις Πραξεσι γραφει, νεφελην τον Κυριον ὑπολαβειν, Μαρκος δε εν τῳ ὑπ' αυτε γραφεντι ευαγγελιῳ, κ. λ.* Ib. p. 652. B.

[i] *Ειγε Παυλω πειτεον, Ἑβραιοις ὑυτω διεξιοντι ταυτα πλατυτερον.* Ibid. p. 762. B.

[k] P. 659. B. 729. C. 732. D. 762. C. et passim.

[l] P. 668. B.

[m] P. 675. D.

[n] *Ὁ παρων θεοσοφος ευαγγελιτης προηνεγκεν εντε τῳ ευαγγελιῳ αυτε—και εν τῃ πρωτῃ των καθολικων αυτε επιτολων.* Ib. p. 648. D.

[o] P. 658. B. C.

[p] *Δισσογραφειται τετο προς διαφορον εννοιαν. Λεται μεν γαρ ὁ τας κηλιδας και τες σπιλες αποκαθαιρομενος. Λυεται δε ὁ των εγκλημαται ἑαυτε απαλλαττομενος.* p. 650. D.

[q] Memorat Arethas duplicem lectionem, *λεσαντι*, et *λυσαντι*. Certe ob sequens *εν τῳ αἱματι*, *λεσαντι* jam in codd. plerosque omnes invasit. Sed *λυσαντι* genuinum est.—*Λυσαντι* hic est *λυτρωσαντι*· quomodo Apocalyptes infra, c. 5. v. 9. *Ἠγορασας ἡμας εν αἱματι σε.* Proleg. n. 1007.

CHAP. CLI.

ARATOR.

1. ARATOR,[a] at first an advocate, then a soldier, afterwards a[b] courtier, thought fit at length to retire from the world, and was appointed sub-deacon in the church of Rome.

2. He composed a work, entitled,[c] The Apostolical History, in verse, in two books, composed out of the Acts of the Apostles,[d] which he ascribes to St. Luke.

3. In Acts xx. 28, he seems to have read 'the church of the Lord:' for he speaks only[e] of the church which Christ, the Lord and master, had purchased with the price of his blood. Arator was[f] an Homoüsian. If he had had in his copies, "the church of God," or had had any knowledge of that reading, he would not have failed to insist upon it.

[a] Vid. Trithem. De Scr. Ec. cap. 213. Baron. Ann. 544. n. 1, 2. Pagi Ann. 544. n. 3. Basnag. Ann. 544. n. 10. Cav. H. L. T. i. p. 523. Du Pin, Bib. T. v. p. 73.

[b] Ecclesiam subeo, dimissâ naufragus aulâ,
Perfida mundani desero vela freti.
Transferor ad niveas Petri sine turbine caulas,
Et fruor optati jam statione soli.
Arat. ad Vigil. p. 125. F.

[c] Historia Apostolica. Ap. Bib. PP. Lugd. T. x. p. 125—142.

[d] Versibus ergo canam, quos Lucas retulit, Actus. Ib. p. 125.

[e] Perpetuo pro rege pati, servare Magistri
Ecclesiam, Christus pretium quam sanguine nobis
Fecit in orbe suo, famuli retinere laborent,
Quæ Dominus de morte dedit.—
Hist. Ap. l. ii. p. 138. F.

[f] — — — unum
Personas tres esse Deum.
L. i. p. 128. D. Vid. et G.

CHAP. CLII.

JUNILIUS.

1. JUNILIUS was an African Bishop, but of what place is not certainly known. Cave speaks of him, as[a] flourishing about the year 550; Hody about[b] 560. He is in Trithemius; and I transcribe his chapter[c] below. Moreover[d] Du Pin and[e] Fabricius have accounts of this bishop, which deserve to be taken notice of.

2. The only remaining work of Junilius, and the only work of his, which Trithemius, in the fifteenth century, had met with, intitled, Of[f] the Parts of the Divine Law, in two books, is written by way of question and answer.

3. He has several ways of dividing the books of scripture. Some[g] are of perfect, others of middle authority, others of none at all: and[h] some are historical, some prophetical, some proverbial, some teach simply. So that to transcribe him at length requires more room than I can afford: I shall, however, take briefly what he says relating to the books of the New Testament.

4. 'The[i] historical books of the New Testament, of perfect and canonical authority, are the four gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, and the Acts of the Apostles.'

[a] H. L. T. i. [b] De Biblior. Text. Orig. p. 653.

[c] Junilius, episcopus cujusdam urbis in Africâ, (nomen autem urbis invenire non potui,) vir certe in sacris scripturis valde doctus, et in secularibus disciplinis, meo judicio, sufficienter instructus, sensu profundus, eloquio dulcis et ornatus, multa dicitur conscripsisse opuscula. Sed ego tantum vidi opus insigne, quod scripsit ad Primasium supradictum episcopum, quod prænotavit, De Partibus Divinæ Legis. Claruit A. D. 540. Trithem. de Script. Ec. c. 155.

[d] Bib. des Aut. Ec. T. v. p. 81. [e] De Veritat. Relig. Christian. p. 255. [f] De Partibus Divinæ Legis. Libri duo. Ap. Bib. PP. Max. T. x. p. 340—350.

[g] Discip. Quomodo divinorum librorum consideratur auctoritas? Mag. Quia quidam perfectæ auctoritatis sunt, quidam mediæ, quidam nullius. D. Qui sunt perfectæ auctoritatis? M. Quos canonicos in singulis speciebus absolute enumeravimus. D. Qui mediæ? M. Quos adjungi a pluribus diximus. D. Qui nullius auctoritatis sunt? M. Reliqui omnes. L. i. c. 7. p. 341. G. H. [h] Disc. Species dictionis quot sunt? M. Quatuor. Nam aut historica est, aut prophetica, aut proverbialis, aut simpliciter docens. L. i. c. 2. p. 340. F.

[i] — Evangeliorum quatuor: secundum Matthæum, secundum Marcum, secundum Lucam, secundum Johannem: Actuum Apostolorum. Ib. c. 3. p. 340. G.

5. 'Those[k] books,' he says, 'teach simply, wherein we are plainly instructed concerning faith and manners; and which do not relate history, nor prophecy, nor speak proverbially, but only teach plainly. The books that teach simply, are the epistles of the apostle Paul: to the Romans one; to the Corinthians two; to the Galatians one; to the Ephesians one; to the Philippians one; to the Colossians one; to the Thessalonians two; to Timothy two; to Titus one; to Philemon one; to the Hebrews one; one of the blessed Peter to the Gentiles; and the first epistle of the blessed John. To these many add five more; one epistle of James; the second of Peter; one of Jude; and two of John.' He also says, 'that[l] the Revelation of John was doubted of, generally, by the christians in the east.' Which may imply, that it was generally received in Africa, as indeed it was.

6. It may be here asked by some: How could Junilius, an African, know the sentiment of christians in the east, concerning the book of the Revelation? And how comes it to pass, that he speaks as he does of the catholic epistles? I answer, that in the preface or dedication of his work to Primasius he says, he[m] had been acquainted with Paul, a Persian, a learned man, who had been educated in the school of the Syrians at Nisibis. From him, it is likely, he received this information, as indeed he there intimates.

7. And in what he says of the catholic epistles there are two things somewhat remarkable. First, that he supposeth the first epistle of Peter to have been written to Gentiles; and consequently the second also, if it be Peter's: for, very probably, the two epistles were sent to the same people. Secondly, of the seven catholic epistles he reckons two only of perfect canonical authority: the other five are only of middle authority, rejected by some, and received by others. If Junilius has here given a true account of what he heard

[k] D. Quæ est simplex doctrina? M. Quâ de fide aut de moribus in præsenti tempore docemur. D. Quare hoc nomen accepit? M. Quia——neque historiam texit, neque prophetiam, neque proverbialiter loquitur, sed tantum modo simpliciter docet. D. Qui libri ad simplicem doctrinam pertinent? M. —Epistolæ Pauli apostoli ad Romanos, 1. ad Corinthios, 2.—Beati Petri ad Gentes, 1. et beati Johannis prima. D. Nulli alii libri ad simplicem doctrinam pertinent? M. Adjungunt quamplurimi quinque alias, quæ apostolorum canonicæ nuncupantur: Jacobi 1. Petri secundam, Judæ unam, Johannis duas. Ib. c. 6. p. 341. F.

[l] Cæterum de Johannis Apocalypsi apud Orientales admodum dubitatur. Ib. c. 4. p. 341. B.

[m] Ad hæc ego respondi: Vidisse me quemdam, Paulum nomine, Persam genere, qui in Syrorum scholâ in Nisibi urbe est edoctus, ubi divina lex per magistros publicos, sicut apud nos in mundanis studiis Grammatica et Rhetorica, ordine et regulariter traditur. Ib. p. 340. C.

from the above-named Persian, it may be argued, that there were some in the east, who rejected or doubted of the epistle of James, as well as the other four: which indeed appears to me very probable.

8. In another place[n] he mentions the books of the New Testament in this order: the four gospels, the apostolical epistles, and the Acts.

9. He puts the question; 'How[o] do we know the authors of the books of scripture? The answer is: Some are known by the titles, and introductions, as the books of the prophets, in the Old Testament, and the epistles of the apostles, in the New. Some are known by their titles only, as the gospels; some by tradition from the ancients, as the five books of Moses. Of some books the authors are unknown, as those of Ruth, the Judges, and the Kings.'

10. He likewise puts the question: How[p] do we know the books of our religion to be written by divine inspiration? I transcribe his answer below, though it be somewhat long; where he also says, 'that miracles were wrought till the scripture (or the christian religion) was received by the Gentiles: but now it is sufficient, that it is universally received; which may be considered as a standing miracle.'

11. Before I conclude this chapter I should refer to [q]James Basnage, who has observations upon this writer's catalogues of the books of scripture, that part especially, which concerns the books of the Old Testament.

[n] Quis est ordo divinorum voluminum?——Evangelia (ut supradictum est) quatuor, apostolicæ epistolæ, et Actus. Ib. c. 10. p. 342. B.

[o] D. Scriptores divinorum librorum quâ ratione cognoscimus? M. Tribus modis. Aut ex titulis, et procemiis, ut propheticos libros, et apostolorum epistolas; aut ex titulis tantum, ut evangelistas; aut ex traditione veterum, ut Möyses creditur scripsisse quinque primos libros historiæ.—Similiter et Jesu Nave liber, ab eo quo nuncupatur, traditur scriptus.—Sciendum præterea, quod quorumdam librorum penitus ignorantur auctores, ut est Judicum, et Ruth, et Regum, &c. Ib. c. 8.

[p] Disc. Unde probamus, libros religionis nostræ divinâ esse inspiratione conscriptos? M. Ex multis, quorum primum est ipsius scripturæ veritas: deinde ordo rerum, consonantia præceptorum, modus locutionis sine ambitu, puritasque verborum. Additur conscribentium et prædicantium qualitas; quod divina homines, excelsa viles, infacundi subtilia, non nisi divino repleti Spiritu tradidissent. Tum prædicationis virtus, quæ, dum prædicaretur, licet a paucis despectis, obtinuit. Accedunt his rectificatio [f. testificatio] contrariorum, ut Sibyllarum vel Philosophorum, expulsio adversariorum, utilitas consequentium, exitus eorum, quæ per acceptationem et figuras pradicationesque prædicta sunt. Ad postremum, miracula jugiter facta, donec scriptura ipsa susciperetur a Gentibus. De quâ nunc ad proximum miraculum sufficit, quod ab omnibus suscepta cognoscitur. Ib. l. ii. c. 29. p. 350.

[q] Hist. de l'Eglise, l. viii. c. 10. p. 443, 444.

CHAP. CLIII.

MAGNUS AURELIUS CASSIODORIUS SENATOR.

I. *His time.* II. *Three catalogues of the books of the Old and New Testament inserted by him in his Institution; Jerom's, Augustine's, and that of the old Latin version.* III. *General remarks upon those catalogues, as here rehearsed.* IV. *An account of his Complexiones, or short Commentaries, and extracts from them.*

I. MAGNUS[a] AURELIUS CASSIODORIUS SENATOR[b] is placed by Cave as flourishing in the year 514, when he was consul: but as I am to quote his works, written after his retirement from the world, particularly his 'Institution of Sacred Letters,' or Theology, written in 556, or thereabouts, I place him at that year. He lived to a great age: but the time[c] of his death is not certainly known. I beg leave to refer to[d] some places in this work, where this writer has been already mentioned.

II. Cassiodorius, in that work, has put down three Catalogues of the books of the Old and New Testament.

1. The first he calls[e] Jerom's: what was St. Jerom's catalogue or canon of the books of the Old Testament, is well known from his Prologus Galeatus, still extant, and transcribed[f] formerly: his canon was the same with that of the Jews; and there can be no mistake about it. But the catalogue, as published in Cassiodorius's work, is not ex-

[a] Vid. Cav. H. L. T. i. p. 501. Du Pin, Bib. des Aut. Ec. T. v. p. 63. Fabric. ap. Bib. Ecc. ad Honorii Aug. l. xiii. cap. 21. Trithem. de Scr. Ec. cap. 212. Le Long. B. Sacr. p. 670. Vit. Cassiod. a Garetio conscript. Pagi Ann. 493. n. iii. 514. n. i. 562. n. iv. S. Basnag. Ann. 534. n. ii. 535. n. x. 562. n. i.

[b] Senator absque collegâ annum aperuit, ut habent omnes Fasti, et ipsemet in Chronico suo prodit. Est is Cassiodorus.—Cumque in omnibus Fastis et in epistolarum subscriptionibus vocetur tantum Senator, eo cognomine uti proprio appellatum fuisse, et ita in Fastis citandis appellandum intelligimus. Pagi Ann. 514. n. i.

[c] Ad num. v. et seqq. pluribus de Magno Aurelio Cassiodoro Senatore agit hoc anno Baronius, quo ejus mortem consignat. Verum annus mortis ejus, deficientibus veteribus monimentis, definiri non potest. Unde plures eum in annum DLXXV. differunt. Pagi Ann. 562. n. iv.

[d] See vol. ii. ch. xxii. num. iv. 3. and num. viii. 6.

[e] Divisio scripturæ divinæ secundum Hieronymum. Auctoritas divina secundum sanctum Hieronymum, in Testamenta duo ita dividitur, id est, in Vetus et Novum, &c. De Institut. Divinar. Lit. cap. 12. T. ii. p. 516. Venetiis, 1729

[f] See vol. iv. ch. cxiv.

act: for the book of the Kings, which should follow after Samuel, is wanting: and instead[g] of Ecclesiastes, is put Ecclesiasticus. Upon this part of the Catalogue, as published by Garetius, Martianay made some free and just remarks, which I place below[h] for the sake of curious readers. The remainder of the catalogue, consisting of the books of the New Testament, is thus: 'The[i] evangelists, Matthew, Mark, Luke, John. After them follow the epistles of the apostles; two of Peter; fourteen of Paul; three of John; one of James; one of Jude; one book of the Acts of the Apostles by Luke; one book of the Revelation of John.'

2. The next is called the Division of the Divine Scripture according to Augustine. We have already considered very largely Augustine's testimony to the scriptures: nevertheless I shall here transcribe the titles of the books of the New Testament, as enumerated by Cassiodorius. 'The[k] New Testament consists of one-and-twenty epistles of apostles, that is, one epistle of the apostle Paul to the Romans: to the Corinthians two; to the Galatians one; to the Ephesians one; to the Philippians one; to the Thessalonians two; to the Colossians one; to Timothy two; to Titus one; to Philemon one; to the Hebrews one; two epistles of Peter, three of John, one of Jude, one of James; the four gospels according to Matthew, Mark, Luke, John; one book of the Acts of the Apostles; one book of the

[g] Salomon: Proverbia, Ecclesiasticus, Canticum Canticorum. Ibid.

[h] Hæc ex Prologo Hieronymi Galeato afferebat Cassiodorius. Sed vitiosa est prorsus illa divisio, tam in editis, quam in manuscriptis libris. I. quidem omissâ ubique voce Malachim, post verbum Samuel.—3. pro nomine isto Ecclesiastes posuerunt Ecclesiasticum, qui non est Salomonis, sed liber Jesu filii Sirach; quique in canonem nusquam admissus est ab Hieronymo. Neque tamen negligentiæ vel inscientiæ accusandus est Garetius noster, qui in ultimâ Cassiodori operum editione hos non emendârit codicum, seu editorum, seu manuscriptorum, errores, &c. Martian. Prolegom. iii. n. i. in Divin. Bib. Hieron.

[i] In evangelistas, qui sunt Matthæus, Marcus, Lucas, Johannes. Post hos sequuntur epistolæ apostolorum, Petri duæ, Pauli quatuordecim, Johannis tres, Jacobi una, Judæ una, Actuum Apostolorum Lucæ liber unus, et Apocalypsis Johannis liber unus. De Institut. Divin. Lit. cap. 12.

[k] In epistolis apostolorum viginti una id est, Pauli apostoli ad Romanos una, ad Corinthios duæ, ad Galatas una, ad Ephesios una, ad Philippenses una, ad Thessalonicenses duæ, ad Colossenses una, ad Timotheum duæ, ad Titum una, ad Philemonem una, ad Hebræos una, Petri duæ, Johannis tres, Judæ una, Jacobi una: In evangeliis quatuor, id est, secundum Matthæum, secundum Marcum, secundum Lucam, secundum Johannem: In Actibus Apostolorum liber unus. In Apocalypsi liber unus. Beatus igitur Augustinus—secundo libro de Doctrinâ Christianâ Scripturas Divinas septuaginta unius librorum calculo comprehendit. Ib. c. 13. p. 516.

Revelation.' And having put down this catalogue, Cassiodorius refers to Augustine's second book of the christian doctrine: nevertheless he does not transcribe exactly. And the books of the New Testament are here rehearsed in a different order from that in Augustine, as any one may perceive by comparing[l] them.

3. The third catalogue is called, the Division of Sacred Scripture, according to the Ancient Translation: meaning, I suppose, the ancient Latin translation of the Old Testament from the Greek of the Seventy, which was in use before Jerom made a translation from the Hebrew. And for the New Testament, meaning the old Latin translation from the original Greek, which had been in use before Jerom corrected it. I intend to transcribe this catalogue at length. 'The[m] holy scripture, according to the ancient translation, is divided into two Testaments, the Old and the New. In the Old are Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua the son of Nun, the Judges, Ruth, four books of the Kings, two books of the Chronicles, one book of the Psalter, five books of Solomon, that is, the Proverbs, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Ecclesiastes, the Canticles: The prophets, that is, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Hosea, Amos, Micah, Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, who is called the Angel, Job, Tobit, Esther, Judith, two books of Ezra, two books of the Maccabees. After these follow the four evangelists, Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, the Acts of the Apostles, the epistles of Peter to the Gentiles, the epistle of Jude, of James to the twelve tribes, of John to the Parthians, the epistles of Paul; to the Romans one; to the Corinthians two; to the Galatians one; [to[n] the Ephesians

[l] See vol. iv. ch. cxvii.

[m] Scriptura sancta, secundum antiquam translationem, in Testamenta duo ita dividitur, id est, in Vetus et Novum. In Genesim, Exodum, Leviticum, Numerorum, Deuteronomium, Jesu Nave, Judicum, Ruth, Regum libros quatuor, Paralipomenôn libros duos, Psalterii librum unum, Salomonis libros quinque, id est, Proverbia, Sapientiam, Ecclesiasticum, Ecclesiasten, Canticum Canticorum, Prophetas, id est, Isaïam, Jeremiam, Ezechielem, Danielem, Osee, Amos, Michæam, Joël, Abdiam, Jonam, Nahum, Habacuc, Sophoniam, Aggæum, Zachariam, Malachiam, qui et Angelus, Job, Tobiam, Esther, Judith, Esdræ duos, Maccabæorum duos. Post hæc sequuntur evangelistæ quatuor, id est, Matthæus, Marcus, Lucas, Johannes, Actus Apostolorum, epistolæ Petri ad Gentes, Judæ, Jacobi ad duodecim tribus, Johannis ad Parthos, epistolæ Pauli, ad Romanos una, ad Corinthios duæ, ad Galatas una, [ad Ephesios una,] ad Philippenses una, ad Colossenses una, ad Hebræos una, ad Thessalonicenses duæ, ad Timotheum duæ, ad Titum una, ad Philemonem una, Apocalypsis Johannis. Ibid. cap. 14. p. 516.

[n] The epistle to the Ephesians is wanting in the edition of Cassiodorius, which I make use of: but I suppose it to be only an error of the press.

one;] to the Philippians one; to the Colossians one; to the Hebrews one; to the Thessalonians two; to Timothy two; to Titus one; to Philemon one; the Revelation of John.'

This catalogue, so far as relates to the Old Testament, should be compared with the canon of the third council of Carthage, formerly[o] transcribed, with which it mightily agrees. Here, as well as there, are reckoned five books of Solomon: in both catalogues are placed Tobit, Judith, and the two books of Maccabees: in both are reckoned two books of Ezra, meaning our Ezra and Nehemiah, without any notice of other books ascribed to Ezra. But with regard to the New Testament, there are several differences in the two catalogues, and particularly in the order of the books, as may be observed by any one.

III. Upon these catalogues, so far as relates to the New Testament, I would make two remarks.

In the first place, it seems hence to appear, that the number of books to be received as canonical scripture, had not then been determined by any authority, universally acknowledged, and submitted to by christians: for Cassiodorius does not say so. And his manner of delivering these several catalogues seems to show, that he had no knowledge of any such determination.

Secondly, Nevertheless there was a very general agreement among christians concerning the books of the New Testament, which ought to be received as canonical, or the rule of faith. There is no remarkable difference in any of these catalogues: the first two have all the books of the New Testament, which are now generally received by us. And if St. John's first epistle only be mentioned in the third and last, possibly, the omission of the other two epistles is only a fault of the transcriber. However, it is well known, and allowed, that the second and third epistle of John were not universally received in the first ages. Once more, for showing the harmony of these three catalogues, it ought to be observed, that here is no mention made of any books of the New Testament as canonical, which are not received as such by us. There are not inserted, in any of these catalogues, Barnabas, or Clement, or Ignatius, or any other christian writers whatever: which affords a cogent argument, that there were not any other christian writings, which were placed by the churches upon a level with those in these catalogues.

[o] Vol. iv. ch. cxvi.

IV. In 1721, Signor Scipio Maffei published a work of Cassiodorius, which had been long missing: and in the following year the same work was published at London by my learned friend, Mr. Samuel Chandler, with the addition of a judicious preface. It is entitled, 'Complexions,[p] or 'short Commentaries upon the Epistles, the Acts of the 'Apostles, and the Revelation.' To be more particular: These notes or complexions are upon the epistles of Paul in the following order: the epistle to the Romans, first and second to the Corinthians, to the Galatians, the Ephesians, the Philippians, first and second to the Thessalonians, to the Colossians, the first and second to Timothy, to Titus, Philemon, the Hebrews. And the seven catholic epistles in this order: the first and second of Peter, the three epistles of John, the epistles of James, and Jude: the Acts of the Apostles, and the Revelation.

1. By which it is manifest, that Cassiodorius received all the books of the New Testament which we do: for about the four gospels there can be no question. The order of the books here, and in the catalogues before transcribed, I leave to be observed by the reader: I shall, however, take notice of a few other things.

2. Cassiodorius expressly ascribes[q] the Acts of the Apostles to Luke the evangelist.

3. He seems to have had a clause in Acts viii. 39, that[r] the Holy Ghost descended upon the Eunuch after he had been baptized by Philip.

4. At Acts xiv. 19, he seems to have read a word or two wanting in our copies: 'And[s] whilst they tarried, and taught, there came from Antioch certain Jews. Those expressions are of use to abate the surprise at the sudden change in the people at Lystra.

5. In the title prefixed to the first epistle of Peter, it is said[t] to be written ad Gentes [to Gentiles]: but[u] in the

[p] Cassiodorii Senatoris Complexiones in Epistolas et Acta Apostolorum et Apocalypsim. Florentiæ. M.DCC.XXI.

[q] Lucas unus evangelistarum, qui doctrinam Domini cœlesti veritate conscripsit, Actus quoque Apostolorum fideli narratione complexus est. Præf. in Act. Ap.

[r] —— et ardore mentis incensus, baptizari se protinus postulavit. Quo facto, Spiritus Sanctus supra eunuchum cecidit, et Philippus subitâ translatione disparuit. In Act. viii. 38, 39.

[s] Cumque ibi commorentur, et docerent, supervenerunt quidam ab Antiochiâ. In Act. xiv. 18.

[t] Petri apostoli ad Gentes.

[u] Sanctissimæ regulæ instituta concelebrans, et Petrus Apostolus Jesu Christi scribit absentibus Hebræis, qui impiâ persecutione Judæorum dispersi fuerant, et advenæ facti per Pontum, per Galatiam, per Cappadociam, per Asiam, et Bithyniam, sed tamen in Christo Jesu correctâ mente credidérant, &c. In 1 Pet. cap. i. in.

explication Cassiodorius speaks of Peter's writing to believing Jews in Pontus, Galatia, and Cappadocia.

6. Signor Maffei thinks, that[v] our author had the heavenly witnesses in the fifth chapter of the first epistle of John: but that does not appear certain to me. I place the passage[w] below: and would refer to Mr. Wetstein's[x] observations upon it.

7. Cassiodorius says, that[y] John had his revelation in the isle of Patmos, where he had been banished by the emperor Domitian.

CHAP. CLIV.

THE IMPERFECT WORK UPON ST. MATTHEW

I. *The author's time.* II. *He was an Arian, and a bishop. His censures of the Homoüsians, and of all heresies in general.* III. *Books of the Old Testament received by him.* IV. *Books of the New Testament received by him.* V. *Books quoted which are not in our canon.* VI. *Select passages.*

I. THE Imperfect Work upon Matthew, so called, because it has not come down to us entire, has been mentioned[a] already. It is usually joined with[b] St. Chrysostom's works, because it was formerly ascribed to him; though now it is generally, or universally, allowed not to be a work of that eminent man.

The time of the work cannot be exactly determined: but it was written after the reigns of Constantine and Theodosius the first, of both whom[c] the author complains, as having gone into measures, by which[d] the interests of the true

[v] P. 251.

[w] Cui rei testificantur in terrâ tria mysteria, aqua, sanguis, et Spiritus, quæ in passione Domini leguntur impleta; in cœlo autem Pater, et Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus. Et hi tres unus est Deus. In Johan. cap. v.

[x] Vid. Wetsten. N. T. Gr. T. ii. p. 726.

[y] Cum esset in insulâ Pathmo, a Domitiano Principe propter verbum Domini in exilium feliciter destinatus, Dominico die voce magnâ commonitus, &c. In Apoc. i. 9.

[a] See vol. iv. ch. lxxxv. num. v. 15.

[b] Opus Imperfectum in Matthæum. Tom. ii. in Nov. Testam. edit. Morell. Tom. vi. edit. Benedictin.

[c] Vid. Hom. 49. p. 202.

[d] Sic ille afflictas res Arianorum deplorat, quæ sub Constantino per Nicænam fidem depulsæ, sub Theodosio

principles of christianity had been opposed and discouraged from that time to his own. In[e] one place he speaks, as if the space of time, between the ascension of Christ and his writing, was almost equal to the life of an antediluvian: which induced Mill to place this author[f] as low as the middle of the tenth century; whereas he may be supposed to amplify beyond the truth. And in another place[g] he speaks, as if there were still heathens, and the rites of Gentilism were still performed in the Roman empire: which, with other things, induced Montfaucon, who has carefully examined this work, to conclude it probable, that[h] the author lived before the end of the sixth century.

II. The author seems[i] to have been a bishop: but of what place, or of what country, is not known.

1. He wrote[k] not in Greek, but, probably, in Latin, the language in which we have his work.

2. The author was an Arian: he[l] plainly condemns the

autem Magno prostratæ sunt, ita ut ab illo tempore 'usque nunc,' sive usque ad auctoris tempus pessum semper ierint. Hoc autem decantat ille fere per totum librum. Montfauç. Diatrib. ad Op. Imp. n. v. p. 6. in App. Chrys. Opp. T. vi.

[e] Et vere tardat, sed quantum ad nostram inconstantiam tardare videtur. Nam si consideremus, ex quo Christus in cœlum ascendit, et quantum vivebant homines ante diluvium, et prope tantum spatium est, quanto tempore erat uniuscujusque eorum. Hom. 52. p. 218. B.

[f] Jam ultra partem seculi decimi mediam provecti sumus—sub hæc tempora, Auctor Operis Imperfecti in Matthæum, episcopus Latinus, quisquis ille, (qui paulo ante etiam in evangelia Marci et Lucæ commentatus fuerat,) homilias conscripsit in Matthæum, ut apparet ex suo ipsius calculo, &c. Proleg. n. 1037. Vid. eund. Proleg. n. 1360. et in Matth. vi. 13.

[g] Ut puta, si bene doceant sacerdotes, et melius vivant, videntes Gentiles dicunt: 'Benedictus Deus, qui tales habet servos.'—Nam disciplina domini ex moribus familiæ demonstratur. Non sicut nostri philosophi, qui magna loquuntur, et nec modica faciunt. Hom. 10. p. 60. B.—Quos orant Gentiles, videamus, ut sciamus quare sic orant. Orant dæmones, qui etsi audiunt, exaudire non possunt—orant reges mortuos, Jovem, Mercurium—cæterosque—Orant idola insensata. Hom. 13. p. 75. E. 76. A.

[h] Ad hæc autem illa quæ de Theodosio Magno, et de tempore subsequenti, de Gentilium religione quasi adhuc vigente, deque Arianismo ecclesias, episcopos, atque presbyteros passim habente. Hæc, inquam, omnia non ad nonum vel octavum, imo vix ad septimum seculum referri posse videntur. Diatrib. ibid.

[i] Vid. Hom. 8. p. 54. B. Hom. 32. p. 133. A.

[k] Unde in Græco non dicit, 'Beati pauperes,' sed egeni; vel 'beati mendici.' Hom. 9. p. 56. E.

[l] Consequenter et hæreticis dicitur hoc. Quando enim vides hæreticos tres per omnia æquales dicentes, ejusdem esse substantiæ, ejusdem esse auctoritatis, sine principio omnes--Implent enim mensuram patrum suorum Gentilium, quoniam et illi similiter multos deos colebant. Quando vides eos, tres unam personam dicentes, et ipsam esse Deum.—Quando vides eos confitentes, ac dicentes, quia Filius de ipsâ Patris substantiâ processit—cognosce, quia mensuram implent patrum suorum Gentilum. Et illi enim tales Deos colebant, qui secundum carnem et generabantur, et generabant. Hom. 45. p. 190. C. D.

Homoüsian doctrine, or the sect that believed three equal persons in the Deity, and of the same substance: where he compares them to heathen idolaters.

3. As this author often speaks very harshly of the Homoüsians, and others, whom he calls heretics, I think it not amiss to take some of those passages.

4. 'All[m] heretics, he says, are armies of antichrist, but especially that, which has seized the place of the church, and stands in the holy place, so as to seem to have the word of truth, but is indeed the abomination of desolation, and the army of antichrist, which has ruined many souls. Insomuch that, perhaps, this is what the apostle means in those words: "Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God,"' 2 Thess. ii. 4.

5. The[n] heresy of the Homoüsians, he says, persecutes not only the church of Christ, meaning the author's own church, but likewise all other heresies that differ from them.

6. He says, that[o] his ancestors, of the same sect, had suffered greatly from heretics: meaning the Homoüsians. This he speaks of as a thing well known.

7. And now I shall transcribe below,[p] somewhat at length, the passage before referred to, where the author complains of the proceedings in the reigns of Constantine and Theodosius.

8. 'The[q] Lord represents all heresies as briars and thorns; but especially the triangular impiety, which he foresaw would most prevail in the world.'

[m] Exercitus autem antichristi sunt omnes hæreses, præcipue ista quæ obtinuit ecclesiæ locum, et stetit in sancto loco, ita ut videatur verbum veritatis stetisse, cum non sit verbum veritatis, sed abominatio desolationis, id est, exercitus antichristi, qui multorum animas reddidit desolatas a Deo. Et hoc est forte quod apostolus dicit: 'qui adversatur, et extollitur supra omne quod dicitur Deus,' &c. Hom. 49. p. 202. C. D.

[n] Hæresis Homoüsianorum non solum Christi ecclesiæ adversatur, sed et omnibus hæresibus non similiter sentientibus. Hom. 48. p. 200. D.

[o] Quanta passi sunt ab hæreticis patres nostri, nullus ignorat. Hom. 46. p. 194. D.

[p] Et nos exposuimus hic auditiones prœliorum, et fames, et terræ motus—et concussiones christianorum—quæ ante præcesserant a tempore Constantini usque ad tempus Theodosii. Abominationem autem desolationis diximus hanc hæresim, quæ occupavit sanctæ ecclesiæ loca, et multos desolavit a fide, et ipsum exercitum antichristi—intelligat esse omnia hæc mala spiritualia, quæ facta sunt tempore Constantini simul et Theodosii usque nunc. In Matth. xxiv. Hom. 49. 202. E.

[q] Et verum est quidem, quia spinas et tribulos omnes iniquos hæreticos appellavit. Tamen forsitan sciens Dominus hanc hæresim prævaliturum præ omnibus tribulos eos appellavit, quasi Trinitatis professores, et triangulam impietatem in suâ perfidiâ bajulantes. Hom. 19. p. 95. D.

9. 'Heresies[r] have the outward appearance of churches: but they are not churches, any more than apes are men.'

10. 'Heretics[s] are worse than heathens: for heathens blaspheme Christ ignorantly; heretics knowingly oppose the true doctrine of Christ.' He speaks to the like purpose in another[t] place.

11. 'As[u] a member cut off from the body cannot live, in like manner all heretics cut off from the body of the one church, cannot have the life of Christ, nor any spiritual good things. But their church is deserted, not by men indeed, for it abounds with evil men, who are always the most; but it is deserted by all good men, and by God himself, and all the things that are of God.'

12. Explaining the parable of the virgins in Matth. xxv. he says: 'The[v] foolish virgins are such as have the faith entire, but want works of righteousness. Whereas Jews and heretics have not faith, nor works; nor can have them: and if they had the oil of works, it could not profit them, because they have not faith to enkindle it.'

13. Upon Matth. vii. 27. "And great was the fall of it:" he says, that[w] heresy is worse than fornication, adultery, or murder. For if a christian should offend in any of those points, he may repent, as David did: but if a christian

[r] Quoniam et simia hominis habet membra, et per omnia hominem imitatur, numquid propterea dicenda est homo? Sic et hæresis omnia ecclesiæ habet et imitatur mysteria. Sed non sunt ecclesiæ. Hom. 19. p. 93. C.

[s] Hæreticos Gentibus esse pejores, dubitat nemo; primum, quia Gentiles per ignorantiam Christum blasphemant, hæretici autem scientes Christi laniant veritatem. Hom. 30. p. 128. C.

[t] Quoniam Gentiles veritatem spernunt, quam non audierunt; Judæi autem, quam non crediderunt; Hæretici autem, quam audierunt et didicerunt. Hom. 41. p. 176. C.

[u] Sicut autem membrum, a corpore præcisum, vivere non potest—sic et omnes hæretici, præcisi a corpore unius ecclesiæ, nec vitam Christi in se habere possunt, nec viriditatem gratiæ spiritualis: sed est ecclesia eorum deserta; non ab hominibus; abundat enim perversis hominibus, quomodo semper malorum major est copia quam bonorum: sed deserta est a sanctis, deserta est a sanctitate, a fide, a veritate, a gratiâ, a Spiritu, deserta denique est ab ipso Deo, et a bonis omnibus quæ sunt Dei, &c. Hom. 46. p. 197. B. C. D.

[v] Fatuæ autem virgines sunt, quia fidem Christi integram habent, opera autem justitiæ non habent. Judæi vero et hæretici neque fidem habent, neque opera possunt habere. Sed etsi operum oleum habent, nihil eis prodest, quia lampades fidei non habent, quas accendant. Hom. 52. p. 217. E.

[w] Et erit ruina ejus magna—sic et christianus, si aut fornicatus fuerit, aut adulteratus, aut homicidium fecerit, cecidit quidem; tamen ruina ejus magna non est, quia iterum pœnitentiâ surgere potest, sicut David. Si autem de fundamento fidei aliquid fuerit passus; id est, si prævaricatus fuerit, et ad Gentiles aut hæreticos transierit, tunc est ruina ejus magna, quia totus funditus ruit. Hom. 20. p. 99. C. D.

turns Gentile, or heretic, his fall is great and his ruin complete and final.

14. Descanting upon Matth. xxii. 33, "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers:" he[x] resembles heretics to serpents on more accounts than one. Where he also observes, what is commonly said of heretics, that they are not uniform and consistent, but very various and unsteady in their sentiments.

15. He decries[y] the baptism of heretics, as altogether invalid, and of no use to them who have it: upon this point he declares his opinion again and again.

16. I do not transcribe these things with approbation, nor with a view of recommendation: far from it. I think that severity of judgment, and bitterness of spirit, toward people of different sentiments ought to be disliked in all men, whatever be their denomination. But as I have taken the liberty, in the course of this work, to observe the defects of moderation in [z]Amphilochius, [a]Gregory Nazianzen, [b]Jerom, [c]Cassian, and others; I have thought it not improper to transcribe all these passages, for showing the temper of this writer also: which appears to me to be far from being commendable, or deserving imitation.

III. My chief concern is with the New Testament: nevertheless I shall take some notice of this writer's regard for the Old Testament also.

1. He has quoted most or all the books of the Old Testament: particularly[d] the book of Ruth, and[e] the Canticles.

[x] Serpentes enim sunt et omnes hæretici, prudentes in malo, et stulti in bono. Et sicut serpentes varii sunt in corpore suo, sic hæretici varii sunt in erroribus suis, et multiplices in malignitate. Hom. 41. p. 191. D. E.

[y] Vide, doctores hæretici quid dicuntur a Christo? Devoratores. Si ergo eruditus es ab hæreticis, raptus es, non eruditus, non pastus. Si baptizatus ab eis es, devoratus es, non salvatus. Nam luporum est devorare, non salvare. Hom. 19. p. 94. C. D.—Quomodo autem nudus vestiat nudum, aut quomodo mendicus faciat alterum divitem? Sic et ipse, qui baptizatus non est, quomodo alteri potest baptismum dare? Secundum hoc et de hæreticis dicimus: Quia ubi est fides, illic est ecclesia: ubi ecclesia, ibi Sacerdos: ubi Sacerdos, ibi baptismum: ubi baptismum, ibi christianus. Ubi autem fides non est, ibi nec ecclesia est: ubi ecclesia non est, nec Sacerdos est: ubi Sacerdos non est, nec baptismum: ubi baptismum non est, nec christianus fit aliquis. Hom. 6. p. 51. B. C. Vid. et Hom. 3. p. 38. B.

[z] See Vol. iv. ch. xcix. num. iii.

[a] The same, ch. xcviii. num. iii. 6.

[b] The same, ch. cxiv. num. ii.

[c] See this vol. p. 32.

[d] Hic itaque Booz accipit uxorem Moabitidem, nomine Ruth. Quomodo accepit eam, exponere existimavi superfluum, cum de his scriptura sit omnibus manifesta. Hom. 1. p. 16. C.

[e] Sic in ecclesiâ, quæ hortus est Christi, Salomone dicente. [Cant. iv. 12.] Hom. 20. p. 95. C.—Sicut in Canticis ex personâ ecclesiæ Sapientia dicit. Hom. 13. p. 75. E.

2. The book of Ecclesiasticus is often quoted in this work: sometimes[f] as Sirach's, several times as[g] Solomon's.

3. The book of Wisdom is quoted[h] as Solomon's.

4. This author quotes[i] the second book of the Maccabees.

5. He has also quoted[k] Tobit.

6. There are several other apocryphal books, relating to the Old Testament quoted by him.

7. As[l] the book of Seth.

8. Another[m] book, how called, is not quite clear; whether Isaiah, or Hezekiah.

9. From[n] some apocryphal book, though not expressly named by him, he had learned the names of the two daughters of Adam, married to Cain and Abel.

IV. I now proceed to take this writer's testimony to the books of the New Testament.

1. It may be worth while to observe somewhat particularly what he says of the evangelists Matthew and John, in the Prologue or Introduction to his Commentary upon St. Matthew's gospel.

2. 'The[o] occasion of Matthew's writing was said to be

[f] Nam in Sirach Libro adventum Christi sic deprecatur. Hom. 30. p. 126. C. [g] Vid. Hom. 2. p. 33. C. Hom. 12. p. 67. D. Hom. 17. p. 89. B. C. Hom. 28. p. 120. D. E. Hom. 29. p. 123. A. Hom. 36. p. 154. C. Hom. 41. p. 174. E. Hom. 51. p. 215. D. Hom. 1. p. 25. C.

[h] Hom. 39. p. 163. B. Hom. 24. p. 105. A.

[i] Hom. 25. p. 112. C. [k] Hom. 26. p. 115. B. Hom. 1. p. 26. C. Hom. 13. p. 74. C. D.

[l] Audivi aliquos referentes de quâdam scripturâ, etsi non certâ, tamen non destruente fidem, sed potius delectante, quoniam erat quædam gens sita in ipso principio Orientis juxta Oceanum, apud quos ferebatur quædam scriptura, inscripta nomine Seth, de appariturâ hac stellâ et muneribus ei hujusmodi offerendis. Hom. 2. p. 28. D. E.

[m] Denique cum ægrotâsset Ezechias in tempore quodam, et venisset ad eum Esaïas propheta visitandum, vocavit Ezechias filium suum Manassen, et cœpit ei mandare, quod debeat Deum timere, quomodo regere regnum, et alia multa. Et dixit ad eum Esaïas: Vere quia non descendunt verba tua in cor ejus; sed et meipsum oportet per manum ejus interfici. Quod audiens Ezechias, volebat filium suum interficere, &c. Hom. 1. p. 21. A.

[n] — quomodo aliquando licuit et sorores habere uxores? quomodo habuerunt Cain et Abel? Hæc nomina filiarum Adam, quas in initio habuit post Cain et Abel, Risam et Edoclam, et non peccaverunt. Hom. 1. p. 24. A.

[o] Sicut referunt, Matthæum conscribere evangelium causa compulit talis. Cum facta fuisset in Palæstinâ persecutio gravis, et periclitarentur dispergi omnes, ut carentes forte doctoribus fidei non carerent doctrinâ, petierunt Matthæum, ut omnium verborum et operum Christi conscriberet eis historiam, ut, ubicunque essent futuri, totius secum haberent fidei statum. Quod autem ab humanâ ejus cœpit nativitate, et humanam ejus generationem exposuit, compulit impia impudentia Judæorum, denegantium Jesum Christum de David semine ducere genus. Corpus autem narrationis suæ ordinavit hoc modo. Primum nativitatem, deinde baptismum, tertio tentationem,

this; There being a great persecution in Palestine, so that there was danger, lest all the faithful should be dispersed; that they might not be without teaching, though they should have no teachers, they requested Matthew to write for them a history of all Christ's words and works, that wherever they should be, they might have with them the ground of their faith. That he began with Christ's nativity, according to the flesh, was owing to the unbelieving Jews, who denied Jesus to be descended from David. The body of his history is disposed in this manner; First, he relates Christ's nativity, then his baptism, after that his temptation, in the fourth place his doctrine, in the fifth place his miracles, in the sixth his passion, in the seventh his resurrection and ascension. Matthew is an evangelist of saints, but more especially of sinners; who preached the gospel to sinners not only in word, but by the example also of his own repentance; nor would he, who had been a publican, employed in collecting perishable riches, have been made an evangelist, to write words that should endure for ever, unless by his example he had encouraged sinners to hope for mercy.'

3. In his first homily upon St. Matthew, that is, in the beginning of his Commentary, he says, 'John[p] wrote for the Gentiles, when he was in banishment among them. He wrote for Gentiles, and therefore he wrote in Greek. Matthew wrote in Hebrew for the Jews, that they might be edified in the faith. John began his gospel as he does, because the Gentiles did not know, that God had a Son, nor how he was begotten.' So this writer.

4. I would observe farther, that in this work all the four gospels are largely quoted; and that[q] the author frequently

in quarto doctrinam, in quinto miracula, in sexto passionem, in septimo resurrectionem et ascensionem ejus—Matthæus, sanctorum quidem, præcipue tamen peccatorum evangelista, qui non solum sermone, sed etiam ipsâ vitæ suæ correctione peccatoribus evangelium prædicavit. Nunquam enim telonarius constitutus, qui consueverat pecunias colligere perituras, factus fuisset evangelista, ut sermones conscriberet in æternum mansuros, nisi suo exemplo peccatores ad misericordiam pœnitentiæ invitaret, &c. Prolog. ib. p. 11.

[p] Quoniam Johannes, inter Gentes in exilio constitutus, Græco sermone evangelium causâ Gentium scripsit: quæ non cognoscebant, si Deus filium habet, aut quomodo genitum habet.—Matthæus autem evangelium Judæis Hebraïco sermone conscripsit, sicut jam diximus supra, ut Judæi legentes ædificarentur in fide. Hom. 1. p. 11, et 12.

[q] Sciendum est, quod Lucas quidem et Marcus statim in primis ponunt dæmoniacum curatum, &c. Hom. 21. p. 100. A. B.—Verius autem, quid sit abominatio desolationis, Lucas evangelista interpretatur. Nam in quo loco Marcus et præsens Matthæus ponunt: 'Cum videritis abominationem desola-'tionis,' in ipso loco Lucas sic ponit: 'Cum videritis circumdari ab exercitu

compares the several accounts of the first three evangelists. Moreover, before he published this Comment upon St. Matthew, he[r] had written an explication of St. Luke's gospel.

5. The book of the Acts of the Apostles is often cited in this work, and ascribed to[s] Luke as the writer.

6. The author has quoted all or most of St. Paul's epistles, particularly[t] that to the Hebrews.

Mr. Wetstein says, that[u] the author of this work was a Latin, and did not receive the epistle to the Hebrews; nevertheless[v] he has plainly quoted it as the apostle's in one place, and referred or alluded to it in another.

7. He has also quoted[w] the epistle of James several times: he seems to have supposed him to be[x] James, the son of Alpheus, and consequently an apostle of Christ.

8. It is needless to refer to quotations of the first epistle of Peter, which was always received; but it may be worth observing, that[y] he quotes his second epistle.

9. He has several times quoted[z] the book of the Revelation.

10. This author therefore received all the same books of the New Testament which we do: and his respect for them is manifest.

11. Moreover he says, that[a] as miracles are now ceased,

'Jerusalem, tunc scitote, quia appropinquavit desolatio ejus.' Hom. 49. p. 202. B. Vid. et Hom. 50. p. 213. D. E.

[r] Vid Hom. 9. p. 56. C. D.

[s] Unde etiam Lucas testatur de illo, dicens: 'Primum quidem sermonem feci de omnibus, O Theophile, 'quæ cœpit Jesus facere et docere.' [Act. i. 1.] Hom. 4. p. 41. C.

[t] De quo ait apostolus: Vivum est verbum Dei et efficax, &c. [Heb. iv. 12.] Hom. 26. p. 113. B. C. Vid. et Hom. 38. p. 159. D.

[u] Cæterum Latinus fuit, qui epistolam ad Hebræos non recepit. Prolegom. ad N. T. Tom. i. p. 81.

[v] See note [t].

[w] Sicut ait Jacobus: 'Si omnem legem adimpleas, &c. [Cap. ii. 10.] Hom. 35. p. 151. D. Vid. et Hom. 4. p. 41. A.

[x] Item Jacobum Alphæi lapidantes. Propter quæ omnia Jerusalem destructa est a Romanis. Hom. 41. p. 174. E.

[y] Propterea dicit Petrus in epistolâ suâ de scripturarum obscuritate, quia non sicut voluit homo, loquutus est Spiritus, sed sicut voluit Spiritus, ita loquutus est homo. Hom. 44. p. 186. D. Vid. 2 Pet. i. 19—21.

[z] Quoniam autem tribus annis et sex mensibus protendendum est antichristi regnum, multæ scripturæ significant, maxime tamen in Revelatione suâ Joannes. Hom. 49. in Matth. xxiv. p. 203. D. Vid. et Hom. 13. p. 74. C. Hom. 19. p. 90. A. Hom. 52. p. 218. E.

[a] Et quare jubet in hoc tempore omnes christianos conferre se ad scripturas? Quia in tempore hoc, ex quo obtinuit hæresis illa ecclesias, nulla probatio potest esse veræ christianitatis, neque refugium potest esse christianorum aliud volentium cognoscere fidei veritatem, nisi scripturæ divinæ. Antea enim multis modis ostendebatur, quæ esset ecclesia Christi, et quæ Gentilitas. Nunc autem nullo modo cognoscitur, quæ sit vera ecclesia Christi, nisi tantummodo per scripturas. Volens ergo quis cognoscere, quæ sit vera ecclesia Christi, unde cognoscat in tantâ confusione similitudinis, nisi tantummodo per scripturas?

there is no other way of knowing the truth, but by the scriptures. I transcribe his words below at large.

V. His division of the books of scripture is that, which is common with all christians in general; apostles[b] and prophets. However, he has quoted some christian writings not in our canon.

1. He has quoted[c] the Recognitions three or four times.

2. He likewise quotes[d] the Constitutions or Canons of the apostles.

3. What regard the author had for these two books does not clearly appear: but I think, that if he had respected them, as of authority, he would have quoted them oftener.

4. He says, 'That[e] Joseph was absent, when the angel appeared to Mary, as related by Luke i. 26—38; and that this is said in a history, that is not unreasonable, nor incredible; for that was a proper circumstance.' Possibly, he speaks more advantageously of that book than it deserved: nevertheless, he gives it no authority.

5. He intimates, that[f] in some secret or apocryphal books it was written, that Christ baptized John, after he had been baptized of him: which, we may suppose, had been collected from words of Matth. iii. 14, 15.

VI. I shall now allege, or refer to, some select passages.

Item antea et per signa cognoscebantur, qui erant veri christiani, et qui falsi. Quomodo? Falsi quidem aut non poterant facere, sicut veri christiani; aut talia non poterant facere, qualia veri christiani—omnem utilitatem habentia. Et per hoc cognoscebantur, qui erant veri christiani, qui falsi. Nunc autem signorum operatio omnino levata est: magis autem et apud eos invenitur, qui falsi sunt christiani, fieri ficta. Hom. 49. p. 204. D. E.

[b] Hæc est ecclesia—quæ legatos Jesu Christi, id est, apostolos et prophetas, hoc est, scripta eorum, recepit. Hom. 29. p. 204. C.

[c] Sed audi mysterium, quod Petrus apud Clementem exposuit. Hom. 26. p. 115. A.—Hoc et Petrus apud Clementem exponit. Hom. 49. p. 202. B.—Sicut autem Petrus apud Clementem exponit, antichristo etiam plenorum signorum faciendorum est danda potestas. Hom. 49. p. 204. E.—Unde et sapienter Petrus dicit apud Clementem, quomodo debet quis incessanter, quæ Dei sunt, cogitare et loqui. Hom. 51. p. 214. C. D.

[d] Aliter certe, sicut apostoli interpretantur in libro Canonum qui est de episcopis. Hom. 13. p. 74. Vid. Const. Ap. l. iii. c. 14.—Quomodo autem quidam sacerdotes ex hominibus ordinantur, manifeste in libro octavo canonum apostolorum dicitur. Hom. 53. p. 221. A. Conf. Const. Ap. l. viii. cap. 2.

[e] Nam sicut historia quædam non incredibilis, neque irrationalis, docet quando gesta sunt quæ refert Lucas, Joseph absens erat. Nec enim conveniens est putare præsente Joseph introisse angelum ad Mariam, ei dixisse quæ dixit, et Mariam respondisse quæcumque respondit. Hom. i. p. 24. D. E.

[f] Dum autem dicenti Joanni, 'Ego a 'te debeo baptizari,' respondit, 'Modo interim sine,' ostendit, quia postea Christus baptizavit Joannem; quamvis in secretioribus libris manifeste hoc scriptum sit. Et Joannes quidem baptizavit illum in aquâ, ille autem Joannem in Spiritu. Hom. 4. p. 41. E.

1. The author well explains[g] our Lord's prohibition, "not to do alms before men, to be seen of them." Matth. vi. 1—4.

2. He largely considers what[h] is implied in 'loving God with all the heart.'

3. He shows, what[i] is to be understood by the 'wedding garment.'

4. He examines[k] the reasons assigned by some, why Jesus Christ is called the Son of God.

5. The[l] ten commandments are handsomely rehearsed by him.

6. He supposeth, that[m] Paul was blamable for what he said to the high priest, Acts xxiii. 3.

7. He[n] read 1 Thess. v. 21, as we do.

8. He quotes[o] Josephus.

9. That miraculous powers had ceased in the author's time, may be seen in a passage transcribed[p] above; where he speaks of studying the scriptures, as the only way of knowing which is the true church.

10. This writer has expressions[q] concerning the eucharist, which cannot be reconciled with the modern popish doctrine of transubstantiation.

11. They who are curious, may consult[r] R. Simon, who has an article upon this author, as a commentator.

[g] Hom. 13. p. 72. A. B.

[h] Hom. 42. p. 181.

[i] Hom. 41. p. 175. A. B.

[k] Hom. 40. p. 169. E.

[l] Hom. 49. p. 205. C. D.

[m] Item cum Paulus maledixisset sacerdotem Ananiam, et audîsset, quoniam erat sacerdos, pœnitentiâ ductus respondit: 'Nesciebam, fratres, quia Princeps erat sacerdotum.' Hom. 40. p. 164. C.

[n] Dicit apostolus: Omnia probate. Et quod bonum est tenete. Hom. 44. p. 186. E.

[o] Quales pestilentiæ, et quales fames, et terræ motus, præcesserunt Judæam, antequam Jerusalem caperetur, cognoscere potest, qui Josephum legit. Hom. 48. p. 201. A.

[p] See p. 121.

[q] Si ergo hæc vasa sanctificata ad privatos usus transferre sic periculosum est, in quibus non est verum corpus Christi, sed mysterium corporis ejus continetur: quanto magis vasa corporis nostri, quæ sibi Deus ad habitaculum præparavit, non debemus locum dare Diabolo agendi in eis ut vult? Hom. 11. p. 63. C. D.

[r] See Hist. Crit. des Commentat. du N. T. Ch. xiii. p. 191—206.

CHAP. CLV.

VICTOR TUNUNENSIS.

1. VICTOR TUNUNENSIS, an African bishop, who flourished about the middle[a] of the sixth century, and wrote a Chronicle, ending[b] at the year 566, says: 'When[c] Messala was consul, (that is, in the year of Christ 506,) at Constantinople, by order of the emperor Anastasius, the holy gospels being written by illiterate evangelists, are censured and corrected.'

2. Some have hence argued, that the copies of the New Testament, of the gospels at least, have not come down to us, as they were originally written, they having been altered in the time of the emperor Anastasius, who began his reign in the year 491, and died[d] in 518.

3. I shall immediately transcribe below[e] a part of Dr. Mill's observations upon this story, containing a brief, yet full confutation of it. And I add a few following observations.

(1.) It was impossible to attempt, in the sixth century, an alteration in the sense, or in the words of the gospels, or any other books of the New Testament, without great offence to christians in general: forasmuch as there were at that time in every part of the known world, in Europe, Asia, and Africa, numerous copies of the books of the New Testament, in the original Greek, and in the Syriac, Latin, and other languages, into which they had been translated.

[a] He is placed by Cave at the year 555. Hist. Lit. T. i. p. 528.

[b] Vid. Pagi Ann. 566. n. 2.

[c] Messalâ V. C. Cos. Constantinopoli, jubente Anastasio Imperatore, sancta evangelia, tanquam ab idiotis evangelistis composita, reprehenduntur, et emendantur. Vict. Tunun. Chr. p. 6. ap. Scalig. Thes. Temp.

[d] Vid. Pagi Ann. 518. n. ii.

[e] Unde hæc desumserit auctor iste, nescio. Verum hujusmodi evangelia nulla usquam in publicum prodiisse tam certum est, quam quod certissimum. Ipsum nomen sane novorum evangeliorum, dici haud potest, quantas per universum Orientem excitaturum fuisset tragœdias, quam graves tumultus, nec fortasse sine Imperatoris ipsius cæde sopiendos. Sed, ut prospere et ex voto successerit ipsi hoc facinus, certe, si evangelia hæc, eorumve particulæ aliquæ evolâssent in vulgus, fieri non potest, quin historici ad unum omnes, qui reliqua Anastasii flagitia enarrârunt, etiam hoc longe super alia memorabile, graphice, suisque omnino coloribus depingerent; cum tamen apud eos altum sit de hac re silentium; neque exstet, quod sciam, ex omni scriptorum turbâ, præter unum Victorem, quique verba ejus transcripsit, Isidorum Hispalensem, qui ῥᾳδιουργιας hujus aliquam faciat mentionem. Mill. Proleg. n. 1014, 1015.

(2.) That no alteration was made in the gospels, or other sacred books, is apparent hence, that our present copies agree with the quotations in ancient Greek and Latin authors, and with the translations made before the time of Anastasius.

(3.) This story of Victor deserves no regard, because he is singular; as is observed by Mill in the place above cited, and[f] by others. There is no other writer mentions it, besides Isidore of Seville, who transcribed Victor: whereas, if ever such an attempt had been made by Anastasius, and any books had been published with alterations, it would have made a great noise in the world, and would have occasioned a general outcry. The emperor Anastasius was far from being popular in his government: and there are extant writings of contemporaries, as well as others, in which[g] he is freely and grievously reproached; nevertheless there is no notice taken of this affair, which would have given greater and more general offence to christians, than any other.

(4.) These considerations, as seems to me, are sufficient to show, that[h] learned men have with good reason, generally, looked upon this story of Victor as fabulous: I therefore content myself with what has been already observed, without proceeding farther.

(5.) However, some learned men have formed conjectures concerning the occasion of this account; particularly that great man Dr. Richard Bentley, in his 'Remarks[i] upon a 'late Discourse of Free-thinking,' written by him in the borrowed name of Philelcutherus Lipsiensis: and likewise[k] Peter Wesselingius, in a Dissertation upon this article of Victor's Chronicle; whose conjectures, and reasonings in support of them, are referred to the curious reader.

[f] Atque hic non dicam, Victorem unum omnium scriptorum esse. Nam Isidori, Tununensem exscribentis, nulla ratio haberi potest, qui Imperatori hoc crimen impegerit. Neque ostendam, æquales omnes, quorum aliqui professi inimici graves contumelias Augusto imposuerunt, horum nihil memoriâ prodidisse, &c. Petr. Wesseling. Dissert. ad Victor. Tun. cap. 1. p. 111. Ultr. 1738.

[g] See note [e] and [f].

[h] Fabula Victoris Tununensis, A. 506. scribentis, Messalâ Consule, jubente Anastasio Imperatore, sancta evangelia ab idiotis evangelistis composita, esse reprehensa ac emendata, nullam fidem meretur. Fr. Lampe Synops. H. E. l. ii. c. 6. n. vii. p. 159. Vid. etiam Ja. Basnag. Hist. de l'Eglise. l. viii. c. 2. n. viii. p. 424.

[i] See those Remarks. Numb. xxxiii.

[k] Vid. Wesseling. ubi supra, cap. 2. p. 132, &c.

CHAP. CLVI.

GREGORY I. BISHOP OF ROME.

I. *His time.* II. *Books of the Old Testament received by him.* III. *Books of the New Testament received by him.* IV. *General titles and divisions of the books of scripture, and marks of respect for them.* V. *Select passages, and observations.*

I. GREGORY[a] the First, commonly called 'the Great,' was consecrated bishop of Rome in the year 590, and died in 604.

I shall take some notice of his testimony to the books of the Old, then of the New Testament, and afterwards transcribe, or refer to some select passages.

II. 1. Gregory has often quoted all the books of the Old Testament, except Ruth and Esther.

2. He has several times quoted[b] the book of Canticles, as Solomon's. And there is extant a Commentary upon that book, which has been ascribed to him: the genuineness of which is denied by[c] some, and asserted by[d] others. I shall not quote any thing out of it.

3. Gregory has not quoted any of the apocryphal books of the Old Testament not in the Jewish canon, except the books of Tobit, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, and the first book of the Maccabees.

4. And these are also so quoted, as to show, that they were not canonical, or of authority, and decisive in the things of religion.

5. When he quotes any texts of Tobit, it is only as[e] the words of some wise, or good man.

[a] Vid. Cav. H. L. T. i. p. 543, &c. A. Pagi Ann. 590. n. v. Fr. Pagi Breviarium Pontif. Rom. T. i. p. 340, &c. S. Basn. Ann. 581. n. viii. et 590. n. vi. Mr. Bower's History of the Popes, Vol. ii. p. 463—543. L. E. Du Pin, Bib. des Aut. Ec. T. v. p. 102—146.

[b] Vid. Expos. in libr. Job. l. xix. c. 30. p. 634. B. T. i. l. xiii. c. 53. p. 415. D. l. xviii. c. 49. p. 595. C. et alibi. Paris. 1705.

[c] Du Pin, as before, p. 141. Mr. Bower, p. 542. Fr. Pagi Breviarium P. R. T. i. p. 375. [d] Vid. Benedictinor. Admon. in Canticor. Exp. T. iii. P. ii. p. 393, &c. [e] Et sicut per quemdam sapientem de cœlesti Jerusalem dicitur. [Tob. xiii. 16—18.] In Ezech. l. 1. Hom. 9. T. i. 1263. A. Cum quidam sapiens dicat. [Tob. iv. 15. al. 16.] In Evang. l. ii. Hom. 38. T. i. p. 1640. C. Cum et per quemdam justum dicitur: 'Quod ab alio odis tibi fieri, vide ne tu alteri facias.' [Tob. iv. 15.] In Job.

6. And exactly in the same manner, when he quotes[f] the book of Wisdom.

7. In like manner Ecclesiasticus, 'as[g] it is said in the ecclesiastical book;' or, 'as[h] a certain wise man says;' of which I have put several instances in the margin; where[i] too it is sometimes expressly distinguished from prophetical writings.

8. In all Gregory's works there is very little notice taken of the books of the Maccabees: in the one place, where the first of those books is mentioned, he[k] quotes it only as an useful book, and makes a kind of apology for quoting a book, which, as he says, was not canonical.

9. I said just now, that the apocryphal books are quoted as the writings of wise men only: I would now add, that books of the Jewish canon are quoted as written by prophets; so[l] he quotes the Psalms very frequently; and in like manner [m] Daniel, [n] Hosea, [o] Amos, [p] Habakkuk, [q] Isaiah, [r] Ezekiel, and other canonical books of the Old Testament; though a little before, or soon after, the books of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus are quoted as written by wise men only.

S. x. c. 6. p. 340. E. [f] Unde per quemdam sapientem dicitur: 'Senectus enim venerabilis est.'—[Sap. iv. 8.] Expos. in Job. S. 19. c. 17. p. 618. A. [g] Quibus bene per Ecclesiasticum librum dicitur. In Job. l. 21. c. 29. p. 692. C. Contra hunc tumorem per ecclesiasticum librum dicitur. Hunc tumorem Dominus per prophetam in pastoribus increpans ait, 'Vos autem cum austeritate imperabatis eis, et cum potentiâ.' [Ezech. xxxiv. 4.] In Job. l. 34. c. 25. p. 785. B. C.

[h] Unde recte per quemdam sapientem dicitur. Ib. l. 20. c. 24. p. 661. D. Cui per quemdam sapientem dicitur, 'Ne dicas; peccavi. Et quid accidit mihi triste?' [Eccles. v. 4.] Ib. l. 25. c. 5. p. 789. D.

[i] Vid. not. [g]. [k] De quâ re non inordinate agimus, si ex libris, licet non canonicis, sed tamen ad ædificationem ecclesiæ editis, testimonium proferamus. Eleazar namque in prœlio elephantem feriens stravit. Sed sub ipso quem exstinxit occubuit. In Job. l. 19. c. 22. [al. 13.] p. 622. A. B. [l] Hinc namque propheta ait: 'Qui perfecit pedes meos quasi cervi.' [Psal. xvii. 24. al. xviii. 33.] In Job. l. 26. c. 14. p. 821. D. Hinc per eundem prophetam [Psalmistam] certanti animæ Dominus dicit: 'Exaudivi te in absconditio tempestatis,' &c. [Ps. lxxx. 8. al. lxxxi. 7.] In Job. ib. p. 822. A. Vid. et. l. 26. c. 18. p. 827. B. et passim.

[m] Bene autem Daniel propheta. In Job. l. 22. c. 20. p. 721. C.

[n] Propheta etiam alius dicit. [Osee.] In Ezech. l. i. Hom. 11. n. 25. p. 1290. D. [o] Unde etiam Dominus per prophetam alium minatus. [Amos.] In Ezech. l. i. Hom. 10. n. 2. 1263. E.

[p] Unde recte quoque per quemdam sapientem dicitur. [Eccles.] In Job. l. 20. c. 24. p. 661. B. Hinc etenim Habacuc propheta ait. In Job. l. 20. c. 3. p. 638. B. [q] Quia et per prophetam alterum dicitur. [Is.] In Ezech. l. i. Hom. 12. p. 1294. E.

[r] Pro eo autem quod multa Ezechiel propheta obscura et perplexa auditurus erat. In Ezech. l. i. Hom. 10. n. 3. p. 1264. D.

10. What I have said here is agreeable to the sentiments and observations[s] of James Basnage upon the same point: and it may not be amiss for an attentive reader, to compare Gregory's quotations of the apocryphal books of the Old Testament with those of Ambrose, bishop of Milan, formerly[t] taken notice of; who shows more regard to these apocryphal books, than this bishop of Rome.

11. In a word, Gregory's canon of the Old Testament appears to be the same with that of the Jews; and, perhaps, this may be confirmed by the general divisions of the books of scripture to be observed hereafter.

III. I proceed to Gregory's testimony to the New Testament:

1. In the first place it is to be observed, that[u] he received four gospels, and asserts their complete harmony; where he calls the gospels of the several evangelists their books.

2. He says, that[v] our Lord, after he had died, and was risen again, and ascended to heaven, wrote the New Testament by the apostles.

3. According to Gregory, as well as many others, the four living creatures in Ezek. i. 5—10. represent[w] the four evangelists, and[x] their complete harmony. Matthew,[y] he supposes to be represented by the face of a man; Mark, by that of a lion; Luke, by that of a calf; and John, by that of an eagle.

4. It is needless to refer to quotations of the Acts of the Apostles, or St. Paul's epistles, which are innumerable: I

[s] Hist. de l'Eglise, l. 8. ch. 10. n. 4. p. 445.

[t] See vol. iv. ch. cvi. num. ii.

[u] Petra autem erat Christus. [2 Cor. x. 4.] De hac petrâ olei rivus exiit, liber Matthæi, liber Marci, liber Lucæ, et liber Johannis. In Job. l. 19. c. 14. p. 616. D.

[v] Et quia ipse Dominus postquam pro nobis mortuus est, et resurrexit, et ascendit in cœlum, tunc Testamentum Novum per apostolos scripsit. Ibid. l. 22. c. 18. p. 720. A.

[w] Quid enim per quatuor animalia, quam quatuor evangelistæ signantur? In Ezech. l. i. Hom. 2. n. 18. p. 1190. A.

[x] Quatuor ergo facies uni sunt; quia, si requiras, quid Matthæus de incarnatione Domini sentiat, hoc nimirum sentit quod Marcus, Lucas, et Johannes. Si quæras, quid Johannes, hoc proculdubio quod Lucas, Marcus, et Matthæus. Si quæras, quid Marcus, hoc quod Matthæus, Johannes, et Lucas. Si quæras, quid Lucas, hoc quod Johannes, Matthæus, et Marcus, sentit. In Ezech. l. i. Hom. 3. sub. in.

[y] Quod enim quatuor hæc pennat animalia quatuor evangelistas designent, ipsa uniuscujusque libri evangelici exordia testantur. Nam quia ab humanâ generatione cœpit, jure per hominem Matthæus; quia per clamorem in deserto, recte designatur per leonem Marcus; quia a sacrificio exorsus est, bene per vitulum Lucas; quia vero a divinitate verbi cœpit, digne per aquilam significatur Johannes, &c. In Ezech. l. i. Hom. iv. init.

only just observe, that the[z] epistle to the Hebrews is frequently quoted as the apostle Paul's, without hesitation.

5. And with regard to the catholic epistles, I observe, that[a] the epistle of James is often, and expressly, quoted by Gregory.

6. He often quotes[b] the first and[c] the second epistles of Peter: I put in the margin several of his quotations, that the reader may see the manner of them, and how Gregory calls Peter the pastor of the church, and first pastor of the church, as well as apostle.

7. And it may be here observed, that he also speaks honourably of Paul, calling him[d] an excellent preacher or instructor.

8. I shall add a passage or two relating to St. Peter's epistles, the second especially: 'the[e] same Peter, the first of the apostles, writing to his disciples, [in his second epistle,] and knowing that there were some who detracted from the merit of Paul's writings, says: "Even as our beloved brother Paul also, according to the wisdom given unto him, has written unto you; as also in all his epistles speaking of these things." [2 Pet. iii. 15, 16.] Behold, Paul in his

[z] Quod Paulus quoque apostolus ait: 'Omnia enim nuda, et aperta sunt oculis ejus.' [Heb. iv. 13.] In Job. l. 17. c. 23. p. 546. E. et passim.

[a] Jacobus corripit, dicens. In Job. l. vii. c. 30. p. 233. E.

[b] Hujus iniqui molas ipse summus pastor ecclesiæ prædicando conterebat, cum diceret: 'Sobrii estote,' &c. [2 Pet. v. 8.] In Job. l. 19. c. 16. p. 629. B. Primus pastor ecclesiæ. Ib. l. 21. c. 15. p. 690. C. Petrus namque, auctore Deo, ecclesiæ principatum tenens. Ib. l. 26. c. 20. p. 833. D. [c] Lucernæ enim nomine lumen signatur scripturæ, de quâ ipse ecclesiæ pastor dicit: 'Habemus firmiorem propheticum sermonem,' &c. [2 Pet. i. 19.] In Job. l. 19. c. 11. p. 612. B.—Hinc Petrus apostolus dicit: 'Adveniet dies Domini, ut fur.' [2 Pet. iii. 10.] In Ezech. l. i. Hom. 2. n. 17. p. 1189. D. Hinc Petrus, gregis dominici pastor, dicit. Ib. l. i. Hom. 9. p. 1258. E.

[d] Unde recte egregius prædicator ait. Exp. in Job. l. 13. c. 8. p. 421. A. Quia et prædicator egregius dicit. Ib. l. 22. c. 1. in. Vid. et l. 22. c. 16. [al. 17.] p. 716. in.

[e] Idem vero apostolorum primus, cum multa discipulos admoneret, atque a quibusdam detrahi de Pauli scriptis agnosceret, dicit: 'Sicut carissimus frater 'noster Paulus secundum datam sibi sapientiam scripsit vobis.' Ecce Paulus in epistolis suis scripsit Petrum reprehensibilem, et ecce Petrus in epistolis suis asserit Paulum in his quæ scripserat esse admirandum. Certe enim ni legisset Petrus Pauli epistolas, non laudâsset. Si autem legit, quia illic ipse reprehensibilis diceretur, invenit. Amicus ergo veritatis laudavit etiam, quod reprehensus est, atque ei et hoc ipsum placuit. Seque etiam minori fratri ad consensum dedit, atque in eâdem re factus est sectator minoris sui, ut etiam in hoc præiret: quâtenus qui primus erat in apostolatûs culmine, esset primus et in humilitate. Pensate ergo, fratres carissimi, in quo mentis vertice stetit, qui illas epistolas laudavit, in quibus scriptum se vituperabilem invenit. In Ezech. l. 2. Hom. 6. n. 9. p. 1367, 1368.

epistles had written, that "Peter was to be blamed," [Gal. ii. 11,] but Peter, in his epistles, says, that Paul was to be admired for what he had written: certainly, if Peter had not read Paul's epistles he could not have commended them; but if he read them, he found it there written, that "he was to be blamed."' Upon which Gregory enlarges, showing Peter's humility, and love of truth or sincerity.

9. That argument depended upon the supposition, that the writer of that epistle was the same who had been reproved by Paul; but some said, that the person reproved by Paul was not the apostle Peter, but another of the like name, called Cephas: Gregory therefore shows, from Gal. ii. 7, 8, 10, that[f] it was he, and could be no other.

10. Some too there were in his time, who said, that[g] the second epistle, in which Paul's epistles were commended, was not Peter's: but Gregory says, they would be of another mind, if they carefully considered those words of the epistle itself, where the writer speaks of 'his having been with Christ in the mount; "when there also came to him such a voice from the excellent glory, saying; Thou art my beloved son, in whom I am well pleased,"' 2 Pet. i. 17, 18.

11. Gregory has these expressions: 'As[h] the apostle Peter says to all the faithful: "Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood," 1 Pet. ii. 9. I cannot tell, whether it may not be hence concluded, that Gregory supposed St. Peter's epistles to have been addressed to christians in general, both Jews and Gentiles, in the countries whither his epistles were sent.

12. It is needless to take any of the numerous quotations

[f] Sunt vero nonnulli, qui non Petrum apostolorum principem, sed quemdam alium eo nomine, qui a Paulo sit reprehensus, accipiunt. Qui si Pauli studiosius verba legissent, ista non dicerent. Dicturus enim Paulus: 'Cum venisset Petrus Antiochiam, ei in faciem restiti:' ut de quo Petro loqueretur, ostenderet, in ipso suæ narrationis initio præmisit, dicens: 'Creditum est mihi evangelium præputii, sicut Petro circumcisionis. Qui enim operatus in Petro ad apostolatum circumcisionis, operatus est et mihi inter gentes.' Patet ergo de quo Petro Paulus loquitur, quem et apostolum nominat, et præfuisse evangelio circumcisionis narrat. Ib. n. 10.

[g] Et fuerunt quidam, qui secundam Petri epistolam, in quâ epistolæ Pauli laudatæ sunt, ejus dicerent non fuisse. Sed si ejusdem epistolæ verba pensare voluissent, longe aliter sentire potuerant. In eâ quippe scripta est: 'Voce delapsâ ad eum hujuscemodi a magnificâ gloriâ.' Atque subjungitur: 'Et hanc vocem nos audivimus, cum essemus cum ipso in monte sancto.' Legant itaque evangelium, et protinus agnoscent, quia cum vox ista de cœlo venit, Petrus apostolus in monte cum Domino stetit. Ipse ergo hanc epistolam scripsit, qui hanc vocem de Domino audivit. Ib. n. 11. p. 1368, 1369.

[h] —— sicut cunctis fidelibus Petrus apostolus dicit: 'Vos autem genus electum, regale sacerdotium.' In Job. l. 25. c. 7.

of the first epistle of John. Gregory has quoted[i] St. John's third epistle; and undoubtedly received the second likewise.

13. Gregory has quoted[k] the epistle of Jude.

14. The Revelation is often quoted by him, and[l] as written by the apostle John.

15. Gregory, therefore, received all the same books of the New Testament, as of authority, which we do, and no other.

IV. I shall now put in the margin[m] some passages, where the several general parts of the sacred scriptures are mentioned: Old and New Testament, consisting of the law and prophets, the gospels, and acts and words of the apostles; the law and the prophets, the gospel and apostles.

1. Gregory bestows high commendations on the scriptures.

2. He has strong expressions concerning the inspiration of the books of scripture: 'Whoever[n] was the writer, the Holy Spirit was the author.'

3. 'The[o] doctrine of the scripture surpasseth, beyond comparison, all other learning and instruction whatever.'

[i] Hunc pedem Johannes Caio formidabat, qui cum multa Diotrephis mala præmisisset, adjunxit: 'Carissime, noli imitare malum, sed quod bonum est.' [2 Joh. 11.] In Job. l. 31. c. 11. p. 1003. D.

[k] — Judas minime dixisset: 'Secundo eos, qui non crediderunt, perdidit.' [ver. 5.] In Job. l. 9. c. 45. p. 319. C. Conf. ib. l. 18. c. 22. p. 512. A.

[l] Et sicut Johannes apostolus dicit: 'Fecisti nos regnum et sacerdotes.' [Apoc. i. 6.] In Job. l. 25. c. 7. p. 794. C.

[m] Quia scriptura sacra per utraque Testamenta in quatuor partibus est distincta. Vetus etenim Testamentum in lege et prophetis. Novum vero in evangeliis atque apostolorum actibus et dictis. In Ezech. l. i. Hom. 6. n. 12. p. 1217. D. Una similitudo ipsarum est quatuor, quia quod prædicat lex, hoc etiam prophetæ: quod denuntiant prophetæ, hoc exhibet evangelium, quod exhibuit evangelium, hoc prædicaverunt apostoli per mundum. Ib. n. 14. p. 1218. C. 'Sed per quatuor partes euntes ibant,' quia scriptura sacra per legem ad corda hominum vadit, signando mysterium. Per prophetas vadit paulo apertius, prophetando Dominum. Per evangelium vadit exhibendo quem prophetavit. Per apostolos vadit prædicando eum, quem Pater pro nostrâ redemptione exhibuit. Ib. n. 16. p. 1219. D. [n] Inter multos sæpe quæritur, qui libri beati Job scriptor habeatur. Et alii quidem Möysem, alii unum quemlibet ex prophetis scriptorem hujus operis fuisse suspicantur; cum tamen auctor libri Spiritus Sanctus fideliter dicatur. Ipse igitur scripsit, qui scribenda dictavit. Ipse scripsit, qui et in illius opere inspirator exstitit, et per scribentis vocem imitanda ad nos ejus facta transmisit. Cum ergo rem cognoscimus, ejusque rei Spiritum Sanctum auctorem tenemus, quia scriptorem quærimus, quid aliud agimus, nisi legentes literas de calamo percontemur? Præf. in libr. Job. c. 1. n. 1, 2. p. 7. vid. et n. 3. in.

[o] Quamvis omnem scientiam atque doctrinam scriptura sacra sine aliquâ comparatione transcendat, ut taceam quod vera prædicat, quod ad cœlestem

4. 'The[p] divine oracles have in them a wonderful depth.'

5. Among[q] many things in praise of the holy scriptures, he says; 'There[r] are obscure and difficult parts to exercise more knowing, plain things to nourish weak minds.'

6. The[s] scriptures, he says, are our meat and drink: he[t] largely shows the benefit of reading the scriptures, and[u] he earnestly exhorts his hearers to meditate upon the words of God, and not to despise the letter of our Redeemer, which he has sent unto us. He assures them, that[v] the more the scriptures are read and meditated upon, the more easy, pleasant, and delightful they will be.

7. James Basnage[w] has referred to divers other proofs of Gregory's respect for the scriptures, which are not alleged by me.

V. I might conclude this chapter here: nevertheless, I shall add a few other observations, and select passages, for the sake of those to whom they may be acceptable.

1. Gregory[x] follows the Latin translation of the Old

patriam vocat, quod a terrenis desideriis ad suprema amplectenda cor legentis immutat, quod dictis obscurioribus exercet fortes, et parvulis humili sermone blanditur; quod nec sic clausa est, ut pavesci debeat: nec sic patet, ut vilescat; quod usu fastidium tollat, et tanto amplius diligitur, quanto amplius meditatur. In Job. l. 20. c. 1. p. 635. A.

[p] O quam mira profunditas eloquiorum Dei! In Ezech. l. i. Hom. 5. in. p. 1205. D. [q] Vid in Ezech. l. i. Hom. 9. p. 1260—1264.

[r] Quia in sacro eloquio et dictis occultioribus atque sublimioribus satiantur fortes, et præceptis apertioribus nos parvuli nutrimur. Ib. Hom. 9. n. 31. p. 1261. A. [s] Scriptura sacra cibus noster et potus est. Ib. Hom. 10. n. 3. p. 1263. E. [t] Ib. Hom. 10. n. 12. p. 1267. B. C.

[u] Studete, quæso, fratres carissimi, Dei verba meditari. Nolite despicere scripta nostri Redemptoris, quæ ad nos missa sunt, &c. In Ezech. l. 2. Hom. 3. n. 18. p. 1337. C. [v] Vid. supra, not. [o].

[w] Hist. de l'Eglise, l. 9. ch. 3. n. 10. p. 465.

[x] Novam vero translationem dissero. Sed cum probationis causa exigit, nunc novam, nunc veterem, per testimonia assumo. Ut, quia sedes apostolica, cui Deo auctore præsideo, utrâque utitur, mei quoque labor studii ex utrâque fulciatur. Gregor. Ep. de Moral. seu Exp. in Job. T. i. p. 6. E.—'Tigris periit, eo quod non haberet prædam.' [Job. iv. 11.] Translatione autem Septuaginta Interpretum nequâquam tigris dicitur, sed myrmicoleon periit. Ib. l. 5. c. 20. p. 156. D. Longe ab hac sententiâ vetus translatio dissonat. Sed tamen quia hæc nova translatio ex Hebræo nobis Arabicoque eloquio cuncta verius transfudisse perhibetur, credendum est quidquid in eâ dicitur; et oportet, ut verba illius nostra expositio subtiliter rimetur. Ib. l. 20. c. 32. p. 665. D. Conf. l. 4. c. 9. p. 110. C.—'Militia est vita hominis super terram.' [Job. vii. 1.] Hoc in loco translatione vetere nequâquam militia vita hominis, sed tentatio vocatur. Ib. l. 8. c. 6. p. 244. A. 'Et alterum similiter velabatur.' [Ezech. i. 23.] Translationem autem Septuaginta Interpretum, Aquilæ, Theodotionis, et Symmachi, solicite perscrutantes, nihil ex his invenimus. Sed beati Hieronymi scripta relegentes agnovimus, quia hanc sententiam in Hebræâ veritate ita positam, non quidem juxta verbum, sed juxta sensum, invenerit. In Ezech. l. i. Hom. 7. n. 23. p. 1233. E.

Testament, which had been made by Jerom from the Hebrew; but he often compares it with the older translation, which had been made from the Greek of the Seventy.

2. Gregory deals much in mystical interpretations, still maintaining the truth of the history, or literal sense. He[y] frequently observes an allegorical, and a moral interpretation, besides the historical, or literal.

3. He believed original sin; and, by way of proof, alleges[z] Ps. li. 8.

4. Gregory supposed, the[a] woman that was a sinner, mentioned Luke vii. 36—50, and Mary Magdalene, and Mary, sister of Martha and Lazarus, to be one and the same person.

5. Explaining the parable of the labourers hired into the vineyard at several hours of the day, Matth. xx. 1, 16, he applies it, first, to[b] the several people and ages of the world; afterwards,[c] to the several ages of men.

6. He had, in his copies, the latter part of the sixteenth chapter of St. Mark's gospel; for he has quoted[d] Mark xvi.

[y] Hoc itaque sub intellectu triplici diximus, ut fastidienti animæ varia alimenta proponentes, aliquid, quod eligendo sumat, offeramus. Hoc tamen magnopere petimus, ut qui ad spiritalem intelligentiam mentem sublevat, a veneratione historiæ non recedat. In Job. l. 1. c. ult. p. 38. B.—Hæc juxta historiam breviter tractata percurrimus. Nunc ad allegoriarum mysterium verba vertamus. Ib. l. 3. c. 13. p. 83. C.—Igitur quia allegoriæ mysteria membratim enodantes explevimus, nunc moralitatis intelligentiam raptim tangentes exsequamur. In Job. l. 3. c. 28. p. 95. D. Vid. et l. 4. c. 12. p. 114. C.—Servatâ historiæ veritate, beati Job dicta, amicorumque illius, mysticâ proposui interpretatione discutere. Ib. l. 6. c. 1. in p. 181. A.

[z] Nam quia unusquisque cum primi parentis culpâ concipitur, propheta testatur, dicens: 'Ecce in iniquitatibus conceptus fui.' Et quia is, quem salutaris unda non diluit, originalis culpæ supplicia non amittit, aperte per semetipsam veritas perhibet, dicens: 'Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aquâ,' &c. [Joh. iii. 5.] Exp. in Job. l. 4. c. 3. p. 132. D.

[a] Maria Magdalene, quæ fuerat in civitate peccatrix, amando veritatem, lavit lacrymis maculas criminis, &c. In Evangelia, l. 2. Hom. 25. in T. i. p. 1544. E.—Hanc vero, quam Lucas peccatricem mulierem, Johannes Mariam nominat, illam esse Mariam credimus, de quâ Marcus [xvi. 9.] septem dæmonia ejecta fuisse testatur. In Evang. l. 2. Hom. 33. in. p. 1593. De. E.

[b] Mane etenim mundi fuit ab Adam usque ad Noë. Hora vero tertia a Noë usque ad Abraham. Sexta quoque ab Abraham usque ad Möysen. Nona autem a Möyse usque ad adventum Domini. Undecima vero ab adventu Domini usque ad finem mundi.—Operator ergo mane, horâ tertiâ, sextâ et nonâ, antiquus ille Hebraïcus populus designatur.—Ad undecimam vero Gentiles vocantur, quibus et dicitur: 'Quid hic statis totâ die otiosi?' In Evang. l. 1. Hom 19. n. 1. 1510, 1511.

[c] Possumus vero et easdem diversitates horarum etiam ad unumquemque hominem per ætatem momenta distinguere. Ib. n. 2.

[d] Unde et discipulis veritas dicit: 'Euntes in mundum universum, prædicate evangelium omni creaturæ.' In Job. l. 6. c. 16. p. 190. Vid. et ib. l. 33. c. 17. p. 1096. E.

15, and there is[e] an homily of his upon ver. 14—20, of that chapter.

7. He[f] speaks distinctly of the ordinary and extraordinary gifts of the Spirit; one sort, necessary to men's own salvation; the other bestowed for the benefit of others.

8. Gregory[g] celebrates the progress of the christian religion, as prevailing in the East and the West, particularly in Britain.

9. He seems to acknowledge, though somewhat unwillingly, that[h] miraculous powers had ceased in the church; and that they were not necessary among believers, especially in a time of ease and prosperity; whereas, in times of persecution, and when heathenism prevailed, they were expedient; and God, wisely and graciously, vouchsafed them; and he can bestow them, whenever the exigence of things requires.

[e] In Evangel. l. 2. Hom. 29. p. 1568, &c.

[f] —Mansuetudo namque, humilitas, patientia, fides, spes, caritas, dona ejus sunt: sed ea, sine quibus ad vitam homines pervenire nequâquam possunt. Prophetiæ autem, virtus curationum, genera linguarum, interpretatio sermonum, dona ejus sunt. Sed quæ virtutis ejus præsentiam pro correctione intuentium ostendunt, &c. In Job. l. 2. c. 56. p. 73. A. B.

[g] Ecce enim pene cunctarum jam gentium corda penetravit. Ecce in unâ fide Orientis limitem, Occidentisque conjunxit. Ecce lingua Britanniæ, quæ nil aliud noverat, quam Barbarum frendere, jamdudum in divinis laudibus Hebræum cœpit Alleluja resonare. In Job. l. 27. c. 11. p. 862. C.

[h] Sunt namque nonnulli, qui cum mira apostolorum opera audiunt, quod, accepto Spiritu Sancto, mortuos verbo suscitarent, ab obsessis dæmonia pellerent, umbrâ infirmitates amoverent, ventura quæque prophetando prædicerent: —quia has virtutes nunc in ecclesiâ non vident, subtractam jam ecclesiâ supernam gratiam suspicantur, nescientes pensare quod scriptum est: 'Adjutor in opportunitatibus, in tribulatione.' [Ps. ix. 10.] Tunc quippe sancta ecclesia miraculorum adjutoriis indiguit, cum eam tribulatio persecutionis pressit. Nam postquam superbiam infidelitatis edomuit, non jam virtutum signa, sed sola merita operum requirit, quamvis et illa per multos, cum opportunitas exigit, ostendat.—Ubi ergo omnes fideles sunt, quæ causa est, ut signa monstrentur? Exp. in Job. l. 27. c. 18. p. 869. E.

CHAP. CLVII.

ISIDORE, BISHOP OF SEVILLE.

I. *His time and works.* II. *Three or four catalogues of the books of scripture.* III. *Remarks upon them.* IV. *Respect for the scriptures.* V. *Select passages.*

I. ISIDORE[a] was bishop of Seville, in Spain, forty years; from the year of Christ 595, or 596, to 636. He was the author of many works, some of which are these: A Chronicle, from the beginning of the world, to the year of Christ 626; a book of Ecclesiastical Writers, or Illustrious Men, in 33 chapters; Sentences, in three books; Commentaries upon the historical books of the Old Testament; Allegories in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament; Of Ecclesiastical Offices, in two books; A book of Proëms, or Prolegomena, to the scriptures of the Old and New Testament; Origines, or Etymologies, in 20 books, left unfinished, and published after his death by Braulio, bishop of Saragossa: and, in the three last-mentioned works are catalogues of the books of the Old and New Testament; of all which I shall take some notice.

II. 1. The twelfth chapter of the first book of Ecclesiastical Offices, is entitled,[b] of the Writers of the sacred volumes; where, after having spoken of the writers of the books of the Old Testament, he says: 'In[c] the New Testa-

[a] Vid. Ph. Labbé de Scriptor. Ecc. T. i. p. 642—650. Cav. H. L. T. i. p. 547. Du Pin, Bib. des Aut. Ec. T. vi. p. 1, &c. Pagi an. 625. 18. 633. 29. 636. 6. Testimonia de Isidoro ap. Fabric. Bib. Ec. P. ii. p. 47, 48.

[b] De scriptoribus sacrorum voluminum.

[c] In Novo autem Testamento quatuor libros evangeliorum quatuor evangelistæ singuli scripserunt: quorum solus Matthæus Hebræo scripsisse perhibetur eloquio, cæteri Græco. Paulus apostolus suas scripsit epistolas, ex quibus novem septem ecclesiis destinavit, reliquas discipulis suis misit, Timotheo, Tito, et Philemoni. Ad Hebræos autem epistola plerisque Latinis ejus incerta est, propter dissonantiam sermonis: eamdemque alii Barnabam conscripsisse, alii a Clemente scriptam fuisse suspicantur. Petrus scripsit duas nomine suo epistolas, quæ catholicæ nominantur: quarum secunda a quibusdam ejus esse non creditur, propter styli sermonisque distantiam. Jacobus suam scripsit epistolam, quæ et ipsa a nonnullis ejus esse negatur, sed sub nomine ejus ab alio dictata existimatur. Joannes epistolas tres edidit, quarum tantum prima a quibusdam ejus esse asseritur, reliquæ duæ Joannis cujusdam presbyteri existimantur; cujus juxta Hieronymi sententiam alterum sepulchrum apud Ephesum demonstratur. Judas suam scripsit epistolam. Actus apostolorum Lucas composuit, sicut audivit vel vidit. Apocalypsin Joannes evangelista scripsit, eodem tempore, quo ob evangelii prædicationem in insulam Pathmos traditur relegatus. Hi sunt scriptores sacrorum librorum, divinâ inspiratione

ment, the four evangelists wrote severally the four books of the gospels: the apostle Paul wrote his own epistles; nine of which are sent to seven churches, the others to his disciples, Timothy, Titus, and Philemon. The writer of the epistle to the Hebrews is reckoned uncertain by most of the Latins, because of the difference of the style; some thinking it was written by Barnabas, others by Clement. Peter wrote two epistles, called catholic; the second of which is by some thought not to be his, because of the difference of the style: James wrote his epistle; which also is denied by some to be his, and said to be dictated by another in his name: John wrote three epistles; of which the first only is by some said to be his; the other two are thought to be written by John, a presbyter: Jude wrote his epistle: Luke composed the Acts of the Apostles, according to what he had heard or seen: John the evangelist wrote the Revelation, at the time that he was in banishment, in the island of Patmos, for preaching the gospel. These are the writers of the sacred books, speaking by divine inspiration, and declaring in the church the heavenly precepts for our instruction: but the Holy Spirit is esteemed the author of the said scriptures; for he is really the writer, who dictated them to be written by his prophets.'

2. In the next place, I shall take a part of his Proëm to the books of the New Testament, omitting some things relating to the particular design of each. 'Though[d] the

loquentium, ad eruditionem nostram præcepta cœlestia in ecclesiâ dispensantes. Auctor autem earundam scripturarum Spiritus Sanctus esse creditur. Ipse enim scripsit, qui per prophetas suos scribenda dictavit. De Ecc. Off. l. I. c. 12. p. 393, 394. Colon. 1617.

[d] Evangeliorum prædicatio quamvis quadrifaria sit, una est tamen, quia ex uno eodemque ore divinitatis processit. Et his primus et ultimus ea prædicaverunt, quæ ex ore Christi audierunt, vel quæ ab illo facta vel gesta viderunt; reliqui medii duo ea tantummodo, quæ ab apostolis cognoverunt; quorum quidem Matthæus evangelium in Judæâ primus scripsit. Deinde Marcus in Italiâ. Tertius Lucas in Achaiâ. Ultimus Joannes in Asiâ. Ex quibus solus tantum Matthæus prædicationis suæ historiam Hebraïco perstrinxit stylo: reliqui vero Græci sermonis eloquio ediderunt. Epistolas Paulus apostolus quatuor-decem prædicationis suæ perstrinxit stylo; ex quibus aliquas propter typum septiformis ecclesiæ septem scripsit ecclesiis, conservans potius, non excedens numerum sacramenti, propter septiformem Spiritûs efficaciam. Scripsit autem ad Romanos, ad Corinthios, ad Galatas, ad Ephesios, ad Philippenses, ad Thessalonicenses, ad Colossenses. Reliquas vero postmodum singularibus edidit personis. Argumenta autem earumdem epistolarum hæc sunt. Instruit quoque per Timotheum et Titum ecclesias. Philemonem de emendato servo Onesimo rogat. Ultimo Hebræos, qui in Christo crediderunt, et postmodum persecutionibus Judaicis torti a fide recesserunt, confortat, et ad gratiam evangelii revocat. Petrus duas scripsit epistolas, quæ catholicæ nominantur. Scripsit autem eas his qui ex circumcisione credentes in dispersione gentium erant. Jacobus frater Domini scripsit unam epistolam, ad

doctrine of the gospel be delivered to us by four, it proceeds from one and the same divine fountain. Of these four, the first and last relate what they had heard Christ say, or had seen him perform; the other two, placed between them, relate only those things which they had learned from apostles. Matthew wrote his gospel the first, in Judea; then Mark, in Italy; Luke, the third, in Achaia; John, the last, in Asia: of whom Matthew alone wrote in Hebrew; the rest in Greek. The apostle Paul wrote fourteen epistles; of which some are written to the seven churches. They are these: To the Romans, to the Corinthians, to the Galatians, to the Ephesians, to the Philippians, to the Thessalonians, to the Colossians; others are written to particular persons; and lastly, he wrote to the Hebrews, who believed, and suffered persecution.' Here are inserted the arguments, or contents, of the several epistles, which I omit. 'Peter wrote two epistles, called catholic: they are sent to such of the circumcision as had believed, and were scattered abroad among the Gentiles. James, the Lord's brother, wrote one epistle for the edification of the church. The apostle John wrote three epistles, the first of which is wholly taken up in recommending the love of God, and our brother; nor is the design of the other two very different. Jude reproves some blasphemers, and unchaste persons. The Acts of the Apostles contains the history of the infancy of the church: the writer is the evangelist Luke, as is well known. In the Revelation of John the evangelist are these several things:' where he largely shows the contents of that book.

3. The catalogue of the books of scripture, in the Origines, very much resembles that in the Offices; I therefore shall not transcribe it so much at length, as I have transcribed the other two: however, there are some things here, which are in neither of the other; these I would take notice of.

The first chapter of the sixth book of the said Origines is entitled, Of the Old and the New Testament. Here, having enumerated the books of the Old Testament, he says, 'In[e] the New Testament are two parts or classes: the first

ædificationem ecclesiæ pertinentem, cujus sententiæ immensam scientiæ claritatem legentibus videntur infundere. Joannes apostolus tres scripsit epistolas, quarum prima officium caritatis commendans, tota in amore Dei et fraternâ dilectione versatur. Secunda quoque, quæ electis scribitur, dilectionis hortatur officium. Judæ epistola increpat blasphemantes in Christo, et quosdam impudicos, sub exemplo impiorum. Actuum apostolorum historia nascentis ecclesiæ fidem opusque describit, cujus quidem scriptor Lucas evangelista monstratur. In Apocalypsi Joannis. Præterea comedit evangelista librum testamenti, oris prædicatione suavissimum, &c. Pr. Libr. N. T. p. 282.

[e] In Novo autem Testamento duo sunt ordine; primus evangelicus, in quo

is that of the gospels; in which are Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John: the second is that of the apostles; in which are Paul, in fourteen epistles; Peter, in two; John, in three; James and Jude, each in one epistle; the Acts of the Apostles; and the Revelation of John.'

4. The second chapter of the same book is entitled,[f] Of the Writers and Phrases of the sacred books. Here he enumerates again the books of the Old and New Testament, and speaks more distinctly and largely of the writers of them, and their titles and design; and then concludes the chapter in this manner: '[g] These are the writers of the sacred books, who, speaking by the Holy Spirit, have written for our instruction both the precepts of a good life, and the rule of faith.' Then he adds, 'that beside these, there are other books, called apocryphal, the writers of which are uncertain; in which there are some truths, mixed with falsehood; but they are of no authority: and he supposes them to be written by heretics: many such books there were,' he says, 'which had been of old written in the names of prophets, and since of apostles: but, after careful examination, they had been rejected, and not allowed to be of canonical authority.'

5. Before I proceed, I would observe here, that at the beginning of the second part of the Allegories of the sacred scriptures, which relate to the New Testament, the[h] four evangelists, with their symbols, are expressly mentioned.

6. Again, in another place, speaking of the four evangelists, and their gospels, he says: 'Of[i] all the evangelists, Luke, the third in order, is reckoned to have been most skilful in the Greek tongue; for he was a physician, and wrote his gospel in Greece.'

sunt Matthæus, Marcus, Lucas, et Joannes; secundus apostolicus, in quo sunt Paulus in quatuordecim epistolis, Petrus in duabus, Joannes in tribus, Jacobus et Judas in singulis, Actus apostolorum, et Apocalypsis Joannis. Origin. l. 6. c. 1. p. 44.

[f] De scriptoribus et vocabulis sanctorum librorum.

[g] Hi sunt scriptores sacrorum librorum, qui per Spiritum Sanctum loquentes ad eruditionem nostram et præcepta vivendi et credendi regulam conscripserunt. Præter hæc et alia volumina apocrypha nuncupantur. Apocrypha autem dicta, id est, secreta, quia in dubium veniunt. Est enim eorum occulta origo, nec patet patribus, ex quibus usque ad nos auctoritas veracium scripturarum certissima et notissima successione pervenit. In iis apocryphis etsi inveniatur aliqua veritas, tamen, propter multa falsa, nulla est in eis canonica auctoritas. Nam multa et sub nominibus prophetarum, et recentiora sub nominibus apostolorum ab hæreticis proferuntur. Quæ omnia sub nomine apocryphorum auctoritate canonicâ diligenti examinatione remota sunt. Ib. cap. 2. p. 46.

[h] P. 351.

[i] Tertius Lucas inter omnes evangelistas Græci sermonis eruditissimus, quippe ut medicus, in Græciâ evangelium scripsit. Orig. l. 6. c. 2. p. 45.

III. We may now make some remarks, and they are exceeding easy and obvious.

1. Isidore, of Seville, received all the same books of the New Testament which we do.

2. About some of these there were then, or had formerly been, doubts; particularly about the epistle to the Hebrews, the epistle of James, the second epistle of Peter, the second and third of John. This he mentions freely: in which I think he is in the right; for it is very fit that the truth of things should be known and acknowledged.

3. There were not any christian writings whatever, beside those of the apostles and evangelists, now received by us, which were of authority: there were, indeed, some books, called apocryphal; but they were so much disliked, and were so contemptible, and so universally rejected and disregarded, that he did not think it needful to mention expressly the names or titles of any of them; nor has he, in any one of the catalogues of the books of scripture, mentioned any writing after the book of the Revelation, which made any claim to be a part of the New Testament, or to be esteemed of canonical authority.

4. The order of the books of the New Testament, as mentioned by Isidore, deserves some notice. There were two parts, or divisions; one called the gospels or evangelists, the other the apostles; and in this last the book of the Acts is placed: moreover, in all the catalogues we see this order; first the gospels, then the epistles of the apostle Paul, then the catholic epistles, after them the Acts, and lastly the Revelation; so it is in every chapter, where the books of the New Testament are enumerated by this writer.

5. They who are desirous to see Isidore's catalogues of the books of the Old Testament, placed together, with remarks upon them, may consult[k] H. Hody. Those catalogues would have been here likewise, and with remarks, if I had had room: as I have not, I must forbear; for it is time to hasten to a conclusion.

IV. A word or two will suffice, for showing the respect which he had for the sacred books of scripture. It appears, in what has been already transcribed, where he speaks of the Holy Spirit as their author, they having been written by inspired prophets and apostles; and he expressly says, that they contain 'the precepts of life, and the rule of faith.' Moreover, I shall refer[l] to a chapter in the first book of

[k] De Biblior. Text. Orig. Col. 69—72. p. 653, 654.

[l] Via per quam itur ad Christum, lex est, per quam vadunt ad eum hi, qui, ut est, intelligunt eam — — — — —

sentences; where he says, that by the law, rightly understood, we come to Christ; and he shows, that the scriptures may be profitably read by all sorts of men.

V. 1. In his Chronicle, under the reign of the emperor Caius Caligula, who died in the beginning of the year 41, Isidore says, 'At[m] this time the apostle Matthew wrote, the first, his gospel in Judea.'

2. Under the reign of Claudius, who died in the year 54, he says, 'In[n] his reign the apostle Peter went to Rome to oppose Simon Magus. The evangelist Mark also preaching Christ at Alexandria, wrote his gospel:' nevertheless, before[o] he said, that Mark wrote in Italy.

3. Under Nero, whose reign ended in 68, he says, 'In[p] his time Simon Magus, who had proposed a dispute with the apostles Peter and Paul, and had promised to fly up to heaven, at the prayers of Peter and Paul, was, at noon day, thrown down by the dæmons who had carried him up into the air: on account of whose death, by order of Nero, Peter was crucified, and Paul beheaded.'

4. I must not stay to make many remarks: I only observe, that this must be reckoned by all very inaccurate, and also inconsistent. Peter, as before said, went to Rome in the reign of Claudius, to oppose Simon Magus. Here the dispute with Simon Magus, and his death, are placed in the reign of Nero, and near the end of it; for about that time the martyrdoms of the two fore-mentioned apostles are supposed to have happened.

5. Of Domitian, whose reign is computed from 81 to 96, he says, 'He[q] raised a persecution against the christians. In his time the apostle John, having been banished into the island of Patmos, wrote the Revelation.'

— — — — — — — —

Scriptura sacra pro uniuscujusque lectoris intelligentiâ variatur, sicut manna, quod populo veteri pro singulorum delectatione varium dabat saporem. Juxta sensuum capacitatem singulis sermo Domini congruit. Sentent. l. 1. c. 18. And see Ja. Basnage Hist. de l'Egl. l. 9. ch. 3. sect. 11.

[m] Matthæus apostolus evangelium primus in Judæâ scripsit. Isid. Chr. p. 268. [n] Eo regnante, Petrus apostolus, contra Simonem Magnum, Romam pergit. Marcus quoque evangelista. Alexandriæ Christum prædicans, evangelium scripsit. Ibid.

[o] See p. 367. [p] Hujus temporibus Simon Magus, cum altercationem proposuisset cum Petro et Paulo, apostolis, dicens se quamdam virtutem esse Dei magnam, medio die dum ad patrem volare promittit in cœlum, a dæmonibus, a quibus in aëre ferebatur, adjurante eos Petro per Deum, Paulo vero orante, dimissus crepuit. Ob cujus necem a Nerone Petrus crucifigitur, Paulus gladio cæditur. Ib. p. 268. [q] His post Neronem secundus, superbiâ exsecrabilis, Deum se appellari jussit, christianos persequi paganis instituit. Sub quo apostolus Joannes, in Pathmos insulam relegatus, Apocalypsim scripsit. Ibid.

CHAP. CLVIII.

LEONTIUS.

1. LEONTIUS was for some time an advocate at Constantinople, and is generally supposed to have been a native of that city: he afterwards retired from the world, and lived a monk in Palestine. By[a] some he is reckoned a writer of the sixth, by others of the seventh century; or[b] said to have lived partly in the one, partly in the other. Cave[c] placeth him as flourishing about the year 590; Fabricius[d] at 610, to whom I refer for accounts of his works.

2. Though he be so late a writer, he deserves our notice, as he has left a complete catalogue of books of scripture, received by christians in that part of the world where he lived.

3. 'The[e] books received by the church, says he, are the books of the ancient, and of the new scripture. The ancient scripture is that written before the coming of Christ, the new since. Of the ancient scripture there are two and twenty books; some historical, some prophetical, some moral and poetical.

[a] Vid. Du Pin, Bib. des Aut. Ec. T. v. p. 85. Hody de Bibl. Text. Orig. p. 648. J. Ens. Biblioth. Sacr. p. 169.

[b] S. Basnag. Hist. de l'Eglise, l. 8. c. x. p. 445.

[c] H. L. T. i. p. 543. [d] Bib. Gr. T. vii. p. 451.

[e] —— τεως αριθμησωμεθα τα εκκλησιαστικα βιβλια. Των τοινυν εκκλησιαστικων βιβλιων τα μεν της παλαιας εισι γραφης, τα δε της νεας. Παλαιαν δε λεγομεν γραφην την προ της παρουσιας τυ Χριστυ, νεαν δε την μετα την παρουσιαν. Της μεν ουν παλαιας βιβλια εισιν κβ' ων τα μεν εισιν ιστορικα, τα δε προφητικα, τα δε παραινετικα, τα δε προς το ψαλλειν γενομενα—Τα τοινυν ιστορικα βιβλια εισι ιβ.—Και ταυτα μεν ιστορικα. Προφητικα δε εισι πεντε, ων πρωτον εστιν ὁ Ησαϊας, δευτερον ὁ Ιερεμιας, τριτον ὁ Εζεκιηλ, τεταρτον ὁ Δανιηλ, πεμπτον το δωδεκαπροφητον λεγομεν, εν ω δωδεκα προφητων κειται προφητεια. Παραινετικα εισι βιβλια δ'.—— Εισι δε ταυτα τα τρια βιβλια Σολομωντος. Μετα ταυτα εστι το ψαλτηριον. Και ταυτα μεν εισι τα κβ' βιβλια της παλαιας. Της δε νεας εξ εισι βιβλια· ων δυο περιεχει τυς τεσσαρας ευαγγελιστας. Το μεν γαρ εχει Ματθαιον και Μαρκον, το δε ἑτερον Λυκαν και Ιωαννην. Τριτον εστιν αἱ Πραξεις των αποστολων· τεταρτον αἱ καθολικαι επιστολαι, υσαι ἑπτα, ων πρωτη τυ Ιακωβυ εστιν, ἡ β', και ἡ γ' Πετρυ, ἡ δ', και ε, και ς, τυ Ιωαννυ· ἡ δε ζ' τυ Ιυδα. Καθολικαι δε εκληθησαν, επειδαν υ προς ἑν εθνος εγραφησαν, ως αἱ τυ Παυλυ, αλλα καθολυ προς παντα. Πεμπτον βιβλιον αἱ ιδ' τυ αγιυ Παυλυ επιστολαι. Ἑκτον εστιν ἡ Αποκαλυψις τυ αγιυ Ιωαννυ. Ταυτα εστι τα κανονιζομενα βιβλια εν τῃ εκκλησιᾳ, και παλαια και νεα· ων τα παλαια παντα δεχονται Ἑβραιοι. Leont. Advocat. Byzant. de Sectis. Act. ii. Ap. Bib. PP. Paris. 1644. T. xi. p. 496—498. Conf. Bib. PP. Lugdun. T. ix. p. 662, 663.

'The historical books are twelve: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy: and of these books, called the Pentateuch, Moses is universally allowed to be the author: but the names of the writers of the books, which follow next, are unknown. The sixth is the book of Joshua the son of Nun: the seventh is called the book of the Judges: the eighth is the book of Ruth: the two next contain the history of the kingdoms; they are really four books, but are reckoned two only; the ninth and tenth then are the books of the Kingdoms: the eleventh is the Remains, so called, because it contains things omitted by the writers of the books of the Kingdoms: the twelfth is Ezra, [meaning our Ezra and Nehemiah,] containing the history of the return of the Jews from the Babylonish captivity, in the reign of Cyrus. These are the historical books.

'The prophetical books are five: Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, and the book of the twelve Prophets.

'The moral and poetical are also four: Job, by some supposed to be written by Joseph: the Proverbs, the Ecclesiastes, the Canticles, which three were written by Solomon: after them is the Psalter. These are the two and twenty books of the ancient scripture.

'The books of the New Testament are six: the first two of which contain the four evangelists: the first Matthew and Mark, the second Luke and John: the third is the Acts of the Apostles: the fourth the catholic Epistles, being seven in number; the first is the epistle of James, the second and third are the epistles of Peter, the fourth, fifth, and sixth, the epistles of John, the seventh is the epistle of Jude; they are called catholic, because they are not written to one nation, as Paul's epistles, but in general to all: the fifth book is the fourteen epistles of Paul: the sixth is the Revelation of John. These are the ancient and the new books, which are received in the church as canonical: all the ancient are received by the Jews.'

4. I shall add a passage, which is not far below, in the next section, where he says, 'Again[f] the times from Christ to Constantine have a threefold division: the first is from the nativity of Christ to his ascension: the next is after his ascension, of which the Acts of the Apostles treat; the third is from that period, and the death of the apostles, to the

[f] —— οἱ δε απο της ανηλήψεως, περι ὠν διαλαμβανουσιν αἱ Πραξεις των αποστολων· οἱ δε απο της περιοδου και τελευτης των αποστολων, αχρι της αρχης της βασιλειας Κωνσταντινου. Περι ὠν διαλαμβανουσι τινες εκκλησιαστικοι ἱστορικοι —ους εξ αναγκης ου δεχομεθα. Μεχρι γαρ των Πραξεων των αποστολων κεκανονισται δεχεσθαι ἡμας. Act. 3. p. 503. A. B. C.

reign of Constantine; the affairs of which have been related by several ecclesiastical historians, as Eusebius Pamphili, and Theodoret, whom we are not obliged to receive; for, beside the Acts of the Apostles, no such writings are appointed to be received by us.'

5. This shows the great regard which was paid to the book of the Acts of the Apostles.

6. I scarce need to make any remarks upon the catalogues above transcribed; every one perceives how clean they are. The catalogue of the books of the Old Testament is exactly and completely the canon of the Jews, except that the book of Esther is not mentioned. Here is no notice taken of those books of the Old Testament which protestants generally call apocryphal; and it affords a strong argument, that those books never were reckoned to be of authority.

7. The catalogue of the books of the New Testament contains all which are now generally received by us, and no others: here is no notice taken of the Constitutions, or Recognitions, or any other christian writings; the books above named were all which were esteemed canonical by that part of the church with which this writer was acquainted.

8. However, he presently afterwards mentions[g] many teachers and fathers, as Ignatius, Irenæus, Justin, and others, before and after Constantine: but their writings were not of authority; they had not been transmitted down from the beginning with that character.

9. It is observable, that Leontius divides the scriptures of the New Testament into six books: this is a particularity; nevertheless, we saw a like division formerly[h] in the Synopsis ascribed to Athanasius: the only difference is, that there the four gospels are each reckoned one book; and[i] the catalogue of Gelasius, bishop of Rome, about 496, very much resembles, in this respect, that in the Synopsis.

10. It should not be entirely overlooked by us, that this writer says, 'After[k] the return to Jerusalem, Ezra, perceiving that the sacred books had been burnt in the time of the captivity, it was reported, that he wrote them again out of his own memory, even all the two and twenty books of

[g] Εγενοντο δε εν τοις χρονοις τοις απο της γενεσεως τȣ Χριστȣ μεχρι της βασιλειας Κωνσταντινȣ διδασκαλοι και πατερες οἱδε. Ib. Act. iii. p. 503. C.

[h] See vol. iv. p. 163.

[i] See in this volume, ch. cxlv. p. 75, 76.

[k] Ὁ δε Εσδρας συνεγραψατο την επανοδον αυτων. Και ελθων εις τα Ἱεροσολυμα, και εὑρων, ὁτι παντα τα βιβλια ησαν καυθεντα, ἡνικα ἡχμαλωτισθησαν, απο μνημης λεγεται συγγραψασθαι τα κβ' βιβλια, ἁπερ εν τοις ανω απηριθμησαμεθα. Act. 2. fin. p. 502. D.

the ancient scripture before mentioned.' Theodoret[l] speaks to the like purpose: some other learned christian writers in former times have been of the same opinion; which may be seen examined and confuted by Dr. Prideaux,[m] in his Connection of the History of the Old and New Testament.

11. I shall put down but one select passage only, in which Leontius says, 'that[n] our Lord was baptized when he was thirty years of age, and having wrought many miracles, and taught the Jews, he was crucified in the thirty-third year of his age.' Whence it may be argued, that he computed not more than three passovers in our Lord's ministry, according to St. John's gospel.

CHAP. CLIX.

VENERABLE BEDE.

1. VENERABLE Bede[a] is placed by Cave as flourishing about the year 701. He was born in England, in the county of Durham, in 672, as[b] some say; in 673, or 674, as[c] others: he died in[d] 735.

2. Bede, beside many other works, wrote Commentaries upon all the books of the New Testament, now generally received.

3. He seems not to have had in his copies the doxology, which we now have at the conclusion of the Lord's Prayer in St. Matthew's gospel; for he has twice[e] explained every other part of the prayer, without taking any notice of it.

4. Cave, in his article of Bede, has published, from an ancient manuscript, a prologue to the seven catholic epistles, wanting in all the editions of Bede's works.

[l] See ch. cxxxi. p. 15, 16. in this volume.

[m] See Part. i. Book v. at the year before Christ, 446.

[n] *Ετεχθη γαρ—και ηυξησε, και γενομενος ετων λ' εβαπτισθη, και μετα το βαπτισμα ηρξατο σημεια ποιειν, και διδασκειν τες Ιεδαιες, και τω λγ' ετει εσταυρωθη, κ. λ.* Ib. Act. i. p. 495. C.

[a] Vid. Cav. H. L. L. E. Du Pin, Bib. T. vi. et Bedæ Hist. Ec. a Jo. Smith. Cantabr. 1722.

[b] Cav. ubi supra.

[c] Vid. Pagi Ann. 693. n. viii. et 731. n. v.

[d] Pagi Ann. 731. n. iv. v. vi.

[e] Exposit. in Matth. Evang. cap. vi. p. 18. Et Conf. p. 91. T. v. Colon. 1688.

5. Bede there enumerates the seven epistles in the order now used by us: he says, 'that[f] the epistle of James is placed first, either because he was bishop of the church of Jerusalem, where the gospel was first preached, and from whence it was spread over the whole world; or else, because the epistle was written to the twelve tribes of Israel, who were the first believers. Peter's epistles,' he says, 'are placed next, because he wrote to the 'elect strangers,' that is, to such as had been proselyted from Gentilism to Judaism, and after that were converted to the christian religion; and, he says, 'that John's epistles are fitly placed after the foregoing, because he wrote to believers from among the Gentiles, who before were not the people of God, neither by nature, nor by profession: moreover,' as he adds, 'many ecclesiastical writers had said, that his first epistle was written to Parthians. The epistle of Jude is placed last; for though he was great, he was inferior to the three forementioned apostles; and besides, their epistles having been first placed, his comes last of course.' Bede proceeds, and says, 'It is certain, that James completed his testimony in the thirtieth year after our Lord's passion; Peter suffered in the thirty-eighth year, that is, the last year of Nero; and in his second epistle he speaks of his death as then approaching; whence it appears, that epistle was written a good while after the death of James; his two epistles could not be separated from each other, since they were written to the same churches: and long after this John wrote his

[f] Jacobus, Petrus, Joannes, Judas, septem epistolas ediderunt, quas ecclesiastica consuetudo catholicas, i. e. universales, cognominat. In quibus ideo prima epistola Jacobi ponitur, quia ipse Jerosolymorum regendam suscepit ecclesiam —vel certe quia ipse duodecim tribubus Israëlis, quæ primæ crediderunt, suam epistolam misit, merito prima poni debuit. Merito Petri secunda, quia ipse 'electis 'advenis' scripsit, qui de Gentilitate ad Judaismum de Judaismo ad electionis evangelicæ gratiam, conversi sunt. Merito Johannis epistolæ tertio loco sunt positæ, quia his scripsit ipse, qui de Gentibus crediderunt, cum nec professione exstitissent. Denique multi scriptorum ecclesiasticorum, in quibus est S. Athanasius, Alexandrinæ præsul ecclesiæ, primam ejus epistolam scriptam ad Parthos esse testantur. Merito Judæ posita est ultima, quia, quamvis et ipse magnus est, tribus tamen præcedentibus apostolis minor est; vel quia.—Constat enim quia beatus Jacobus tricesimo post passionem Domini anno suum consummavit martyrium. Petrus tricesimo octavo, hoc est, ultimo anno Neronis, passus est, et ipse in secundâ suâ scripsit epistolâ: 'Certus sum' [Cap. i. 14.] Unde patet, quia imminente passione hanc scripsit epistolam, cum multo ante Jacobus migravit ad Christum. Neque vero conveniebat ejus epistolas ad invicem separari, quas iisdem scripsit ecclesiis. Porro Joannes multo post tempore suas epistolas simul et evangelium scripsit, qui post occisionem Dominicam [Domitiani] reversus de exilio turbatam se absente per hæreticos reperit ecclesiam, quos in suis epistolis percutiens sæpe cognominat antichristos. Ap. Cav. H. L. T. i. p. 614.

epistles, and his gospel, all about the same time; for after the death of Domitian, being returned from his exile, he found the church disturbed by heretics, which had arisen in his absence, whom, in his epistles, he often calls antichrists.'

6. I would add, that[g] the late Dr. Humphry Hody has distinctly considered Bede's testimony to the books of the Old Testament.

CHAP. CLX.

JOHN DAMASCENUS.

I. *His time.* II. *A catalogue of the books of the Old and New Testament.* III. *Remarks upon it.* IV. *Select passages and observations, showing his respect for the scriptures.*

I. JOHN DAMASCENUS,[a] descended of a good family at Damascus, and, in the latter part of his life, monk and presbyter, flourished about the year 730.

II. In a work, entitled Of the Orthodox Faith, he has a chapter[b] concerning scripture; where he has inserted a catalogue of the books of the Old and New Testament. It is to this purpose: 'There[c] is one God declared by the Old and New Testament.—It[d] is to be observed, then, that there are two and twenty books of the Old Testament, according to the letters of the Hebrew language; for they have two and twenty letters, five of which are written two ways, so as to make seven and twenty.—According to this method of computing, the books are reckoned 22 in number, but are really 27, for five of them are double: Ruth, joined with the Judges, is reckoned one book by the Hebrews; in like manner the first and second of the Kingdoms are one book; the third and fourth of the Kingdoms also are one

[g] De Bibl. Text. Orig. p. 654. col. 73.

[a] Vid. Cav. H. L. T. i. p. 624. Oudin. de Scrip. Ecc. T. i. p. 1714, &c. Du Pin, T. vi. p. 101. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. viii. p. 772, &c.

[b] Περι γραφης. [c] Εις εστιν θεος, ὑπο τε παλαιας διαθηκης και καινης κηρυττομενος, &c. De Fide Orthodoxa. l. iv. c. 17. in. T. i. p. 282. B. [d] Ιστεον δε, ως εικοσι και δυο βιβλοι εισι της παλαιας διαθηκης, κατα τα στοιχεια της Ἑβραϊδος φωνης. Ib. p. 283. C.

book; the first and second of the Remains, one book; the first and second of Ezra, one book: so[e] that there are four pentateuchs, and two over, which are in the canon; [or, 'in the Testament']; and they are these: Five of the Law: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy; that[f] is the first pentateuch, called the Law: then[g] five more, sometimes called Hagiographa; [or 'sacred writings;'] Joshua the son of Nun; Judges, with Ruth; the first and second of the Kingdoms, reckoned one book; the third and fourth of the Kingdoms, one book; and the two books of the Remains, also reckoned one book: that is the second pentateuch. The third pentateuch contains the[h] books written in verse; the book of Job; the Psalter; the Proverbs of Solomon; the Ecclesiastes, of the same; the Song of Songs, of the same. The[i] fourth pentateuch takes in the prophets; the twelve prophets, one book; Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel; then the book of Ezra, two joined in one book; and Esther; the[k] book of the Wisdom of Solomon, and the Wisdom of Jesus, which the father of Sirach published in Hebrew, and his grandson, Jesus, the son of Sirach, afterwards translated into Greek, are excellent and useful; but they are not numbered with the former, nor were they placed in the ark.

'The books of the New Testament are these: the four gospels, according to Matthew, according to Mark, according to Luke, according to John; the Acts of the Apostles, by the evangelist Luke; seven catholic epistles, one of James, two of Peter, three of John, one of Jude; fourteen epistles of the apostle Paul; the Revelation by the evangelist John; the canons[l] of the holy apostles by Clement.'

III. Upon this we may make a few remarks:

1. This author, though a native of Damascus, wrote in Greek, and is supposed to represent the sentiment or doctrine of the Greek church of his time.

2. His catalogue of the books of the Old Testament, as has been already observed by learned men, is the same with

[e] Οὑτως ἀν συγκεινται αἱ βιβλοι εν πεντατευχοις τετρασι, και μενασιν αλλαι δυο· ως ειναι τας ενδιαθετας βιβλας ὑτους. Ibid. p. 283. D.

[f] Αυτη πρωτη πεντατευχος, ἡ και νομοθεσια. p. 284. A.

[g] Ειτα αλλη πεντατευχος, τα καλαμενα γραφεια, παρα τισι δε ἁγιογραφα. Ibid.

[h] Αἱ στιχηρεις βιβλοι. Ibid.

[i] Τεταρτη πεντατευχος, ἡ προφητικη.

[k] Ἡ δε παναρετος, τατεσιν ἡ Σοφια τα Σολομωντος, και ἡ Σοφια τα Ιησα, ἡν ὁ πατηρ μεν τα Σιραχ εξεθετο ἑβραϊστι, ἑλληνιστι δε ἡρμηνευσεν ὁ τατα εγγονος Ιησας, τα δε Σιραχ υἱος· εναρετοι μεν και καλαι· αλλ' ακ αριθμανται, ακδε εκειντο εν τη κιβωτω. Ibid. p. 284. B.

[l] Κανονες των αγιων αποστολων δια Κλημεντος.

that of Epiphanius in his book of Weights and Measures, of which we took notice[m] formerly; and it is very agreeable to that which Melito brought with him from Palestine, of which we also took some notice[n] formerly; not now to mention any other.

3. J. Damascenus speaks only of two books of the secondary order, in the Old Testament; the book of Wisdom, and Ecclesiasticus: he does not mention any other, no, not so much as the books of Maccabees. The book of Wisdom he calls Solomon's, though he did not think it to be his, in compliance, it is likely, with frequent custom at that time.

4. His canon of the New Testament is the same with that now generally received by christians in this part of the world; except that here is added the Apostolical Canons by Clement, which seems to be a singularity. What Mill says relating to this in his Prolegomena I place[o] below: I shall also transcribe below the[p] note of Lequien, editor of Damascenus, upon this place; which, I believe, will be acceptable to my readers, on account of some observations relating to the Apostolical Canons.

And I beg leave to observe farther myself: Damascenus's catalogue of the books of scripture is very different from that in the 85th Apostolical Canon; in that are inserted Judith, and the books of Maccabees, which are quite omitted by Damascenus: moreover he receives the book of the Revelation, omitted in the same canon; and farther, he takes no particular notice of the two epistles of Clement, or of the Constitutions, which make a part of the catalogue in the last canon of the apostles. What shall we say to this?

[m] See vol. iv. ch. lxxxiv. num. ii. and ch. cxiv. num. iv. 2.

[n] See vol. ii. ch. xv. and vol. iv. ch. cxiv. num. iv. 2.

[o] Joannes Damascenus—inter canonicos reponit Canones Apostolorum *δια Κλημεντος*. Nempe cum universum Canonum 85 apostolicorum corpus superiore seculo synodice confirmâssent Patres Trullani, facile deinceps factum, ut a librariis (seu arbitrio suopte, seu etiam jussu superiorum) canonicis libris isti adnecterentur, tamquam ejusdem, si placet, cum reliquis juris et auctoritatis. Et talem quidem nactus jam videtur Damascenus. Proleg. n. 1027.

[p] Horum canonum auctoritas adstructa fuerat can. 2 Trullano. At viris criticæ artis incuriosis satis erat præfixum canonibus, qui magnæ dudum in Oriente ponderis erant, apostolorum nomen; cum tamen nihil aliud essent, nisi priscæ Orientalium disciplinæ præcipua capita, quorum auctores genuini ignorabantur. Jam dixi, eorum quosdam conditos esse post exortam hæresim Anomæorum. Beveregius collectionem primam istorum Canonum a Clemente, non Romano, sed Alexandrino factam, quem Eusebius, l. vi. Hist. c. 23. Hieronymus de Scr. Ec. et Photius cod. cxi. *περι κανονων εκκλησιαστικων* volumen edidisse testantur. Sed ex horum auctorum inspectione manifestum fit, eos non de hac collectione canonum loqui, sed de libro, in quo, adductis canonibus, seu regulis ecclesiasticis, illos impugnabat, qui Judaicis legibus et institutis adhærescerent. Lequien ad J. Damasc. p. 284.

Can we think, after all, that Damascenus had any particular regard for the Apostolical Canons? or shall we suppose that the 85th canon was wanting in his edition of the Apostolical Canons? or shall we not be obliged to admit a suspicion, that the last clause in this catalogue of Damascenus, 'the Canons of the holy Apostles by Clement,' is an interpolation, or an addition made by some officious Greek to Damascenus's original work?

There is another doubt that may arise in the mind, supposing the genuineness of this clause: Whether by the Canons of the apostles, Damascenus means Apostolical Constitutions, or Apostolical Canons; I perceive this doubt to have arisen in[q] Cotelerius, as it had in me, before I had observed it in him.

IV. I shall observe but a few particulars more:

1. At the beginning of his work, De Orthodoxa Fide, which is a kind of system of divinity, and reckoned to be the first regular system among christians, speaking of God, he says: 'All[r] things which are delivered to us by the law and the prophets, the apostles and evangelists, we receive, acknowledge, and venerate, seeking not any thing beyond what has been taught by them.'

2. Again: 'We[s] cannot think, or say any thing of God, beside what is divinely taught and revealed to us by the divine oracles of the Old and New Testament.' Not that[t] he denies the use of reason, or that heathen people, without revelation, might, by the light of nature, learn the existence of God from his works: however, in these passages we see the general divisions of the books of scripture, and the great respect which was shown to them by christian people.

3. Damascenus seems[u] not to have had the heavenly witnesses in his copies of St. John's first epistle.

[q] Cæterum an Joannes Damascenus Orthodoxæ Fidei, lib. iv. c. 18. quando Canones Apostolorum per Clementem editos cum divinis voluminibus enumerat Constitutiones vel dumtaxat Canones Constitutionibus subnexos intelligat, quæri potest. Malim accipere de solis canonibus, quo majori parte erroris vir sanctus et doctus levetur, et quia rarior prima acceptio, &c. Coteler. Judic. de Constit. Ap. ap. Patr. Ap. T. i.

[r] *Παντα τοινυν τα παραδεδομενα ἡμιν δια τε νομε, και προφητων, και αποστολων, και ευαγγελιστων, δεχομεθα, και γινωσκομεν, και σεβομεν, ουδεν περαιτερω τουτων επιζητουντες, κ. λ.* De Fid. Orth. l. i. c. 1. T. i. p. 123. E.

[s] *Ου δυνατον ουν τι παρα θεωδως ὑπο των θειων λογιων της τε παλαιας και καινης διαθηκης ἡμιν εκπεφασμενα—ειπειν τε περι θεε, ἡ ὁλως εννοησαι.* Ib. cap. ii. p. 125. B.

[t] Vid. Ib. l. i. c. 1. et c. 3. et alibi.

[u] *Και τρεις εισιν οἱ μαρτυρουντες, το ὑδωρ, και το αἱμα, και το πνευμα.* De Hymn. Trisag. sect. iv. T. i. p. 484. C.

4. He seems to say, that[v] there were then no extraordinary gifts in the church; such as the gift of knowledge, or the gift of miracles; at least he acknowledges, that he had no such gifts.

CHAP. CLXI.

PHOTIUS, PATRIARCH OF CONSTANTINOPLE.

1. PHOTIUS, as is generally reckoned, was constituted patriarch of Constantinople in 858: but [a] Pagi placeth the commencement of his patriarchate in 857. It is generally supposed that he died in 891, or 892.

2. The history of his life, and his character, and good accounts of his works, may be seen in divers[b] authors, to whom I refer. The account, which Fabricius[c] has given of his Bibliotheque, and the several articles therein, deserves high commendations. I shall by and by take some farther notice of Photius's works, so far as they relate to the interpretation of scripture.

3. They who are pleased to look back to the ninth section of the 63d chapter of this book, may there[d] see, that Photius received the scriptures of the Old and the New Testament, and particularly, in this last, four gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, fourteen epistles of St. Paul, and seven catholic epistles: I suppose likewise, that he received the book of the Revelation; though I do not now recollect any particular proof of it.

4. Among the works of Photius are mentioned some Commentaries upon scripture; as upon[e] the Psalms, the[f]

[v] Ἡμεις δε οἱ μηδε το των θαυματων, μηδε το της διδασκαλιας δεξαμενοι χαρισμα. De Fid. Orth. l. i. c. 3. p. 125. D.

[a] Crit. in Baron. Ann. 886. n. v. 858. n. xiii. xiv. 859. n. xii.

[b] Vid. Martin. Hank de Rer. Byz. Script. P. i. cap. 18. Cav. Hist. Lit. T. ii. p. 47. Fabric. Bib. Gr. lib. v. cap. 38. T. ix. p. 369, &c. Du Pin, Bibl. T. vii. J. C. Wolff. Præf. ad Anecd. Gr. T. i. Ja. Basnag. Hist. de l'Eglise, l. vi. ch. vi. T. i. p. 323, &c.

[c] Bib. Gr. T. ix. p. 381—508.

[d] Vol. iii. p. 447, 448.

[e] In Psalmos: Catena ex Athanasio, Basilio, Chrysostomo, et Theodoro Heracleotâ, Photio. MS. in Bib. Segueriana sive Coislniana. Vide Catal. MS. ejusdem Bib. editum a Cl. Montfauconio. p. 58, 59. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. ix. p. 566.

[f] 'Prophetarum liber cum expositione.' Extat. MS. in Bibliothecâ Vaticanâ, uti Possevinus nos docet. Cav. H. L. T. ii. p. 50.

Prophets, and St. Paul's epistles: which last is in manuscript in the public library at Cambridge, as we are assured by Cave. I place below[g] Fabricius's account of it.

5. In[h] the epistles of Photius, in number 248, published at London in 1651, by R. Montague, bishop of Norwich, many texts of scripture are explained.

6. There is extant in manuscript, in several libraries, a work entitled Amphilochia, consisting of 308 questions, and answers to them, addressed by Photius to Amphilochius, bishop or metropolitan of Cyzicum, to whom several of Photius's letters, published by Montague, are directed. Both [i]Cave and [k]Fabricius have spoken somewhat largely of this work, and deserve to be consulted. The learned Montfaucon observes, that[l] those questions relate chiefly to divers texts of scripture, with some other matters of literature: and in his Bibliotheca Coisliniana he has exhibited the title and first words of each chapter; or the question, and the first words of the answer. Many of those questions[m] are treated in the epistles of Photius before mentioned; which, nevertheless, Montfaucon takes no notice of: whereas, it seems to me, it would have well become the diligence of an exact editor, as he put down the titles of the chapters of that work, to have added a reference to the epistles already published, in which the answer might be seen at length. Moreover, after having put down the 308 questions, in the manner above mentioned, he transcribes at length[n] four of them, as specimens of the whole, and as of

In prophetas. MS. in Bib. Vaticanâ, ut ex Possevino Colomesius et Caveus. Fabric. ib. p. 566.

[g] 'In epistolas Pauli.' MS. in Bib. Cantabrigiensi. Ex hoc commentario idem Caveus notat, plura desumsisse Œcumenium, (a quo etiam nomine tenus non raro Photius laudatur) codicem vero istum esse mutilum initio et fine, et totum in epistolam ad Romanos commentarium desiderari. Fabr. ibid. p. 566. [h] Vid. Fabr. ib. p. 519.

[i] Quæstiones ac Dubia ad Amphilochium Cyzici Metropolitam, de variis S. Scripturæ locis. Extant MSS. grandi volumine, sed absque Photii nomine, in Cl. Segurii Galliæ Cancelarii Bibliothecâ: item in Bibliothesis Vaticanâ, Barberinâ, Bavaricâ, et forsan alibi. Cav. T. ii. p. 49. [k] T. ix. p. 561.

[l] Sunt porro quæstiones et plurimum circa loca varia Scripturæ Sacræ tam Veteris quam Novi Testamenti. Intermixtæ quoque sunt aliæ philosophicæ, physicæ, grammaticæ, et aliæ id genus. Ipsæque omnes sunt numero 308. Montf. Bib. Coisl. p. 326.

[m] Mr. Wolfius computes that about a sixth part of the Amphilochian questions are in the epistles published by Bishop Montague. Quod ad Amphilochia ipsa spectat, sexta circiter illorum pars in epistolis Photii, quas eruditæ Montacutii industriæ debemus, extat. Vid. reliqua. Wolf. Præf. ad Curar. vol. iv. [n] Ex hisce porro quæstionibus paucas, quæ majoris esse videntur momenti, hic edendas duximus. Bib. Coisl. p. 345. fin.

some special moment: two of which, nevertheless, had been before published in Montague's collection of our[o] author's epistles. One of those two questions Montfaucon recommends to the observation of[p] the learned, as a curiosity. All this Montfaucon perceived, when he came to write his preface: nevertheless, he still calls this last-mentioned question, with the answer, an[q] anecdote; and the better to justify himself, he says, there are some faults in Montague's edition. Well, then, let it be republished from the Coislinian manuscript, as a better copy, though the errors in Montague are not numerous: but let it not appear as a new thing, or be recommended to the attention of the public as somewhat extraordinary.

The late learned J. C. Wolfius, of Hamburg, published a large part of the Amphilochian questions, and the answers at length, at the end of the fourth and last volume of his Curæ upon the New Testament.

7. This great critic was a great admirer of the apostle Paul, and[r] celebrates his manly and unaffected eloquence: indeed, in one of his[s] letters, Photius takes notice of a large number of hyperbata, or elliptical expressions, in St. Paul's epistles, where some words are transposed, and do not stand in their natural order; but then, near the conclusion of that letter, he says: 'There[t] are many like elliptical expressions in Homer, Antimachus, Aristophanes, Thucydides, Plato, and Demosthenes, and in almost all other poets and orators.' We may here recollect what Irenæus said long ago, 'that[u] the apostle frequently useth hyperbata, because 'of the rapidity of his words, and because of the mighty 'force of the Spirit in him.'

8. I shall select a few explications of texts of scripture. The first is in[v] an epistle of Photius, which is also[w] an Amphilochian question. The text is Luke xxii. 44. He says, 'that[x] to "sweat blood," was a proverbial expression,

[o] Ep. 144. p. 201. Ep. 209. p. 306. [p] Quæstio clxvi. Digna sane quæ historiæ ecclesiasticæ peritis offeratur. Cujus hæresis erat Eusebius Pamphili. Bib. Coislin. p. 348.

[q] Vigesimum nonum (anecdoton) ejusdem Photii quæstio, cujus hæresis esset Eusebius Pamphili. In eâ vero, quæ de Eusebio agit, mendæ sunt quædam, interque alias, πολλαι pro πολλοι, quæ lectio sensum alio transfert. Id. in Præf. ad Bib. Coisl.

[r] Vid. Ep. 165, 166. [s] Ep. 166. Vid. et Ep. 164.

[t] Και οιδα ὁτι εκ αν σοι δοξῃ παραδοξον, ειναι το τοιουτον της ελλειψεως ειδος· Πολλα γαρ τοιαυτα και παρ' Ὁμηρῳ, και Αντιμαχῳ, κ. λ. Ep. 166. p. 240. [u] See vol. ii. p. 176.

[v] Ep. 138. p. 193. [w] Qu. 164. ap. Bib. Coisl. p. 338.

[x] Παροιμια λεγεται, επι των σφοδρα λυπουμενων και αγωνιωντων· αἱματι ἱδρυσεν. Ὡσπερ και επι των πικρως οδυρομενων· αἱματι κλαιει—ὁτι, ωσει

concerning such as were in a great agony of mind. So likewise it is said of such as are in great grief, that they weep tears of blood: nor does St. Luke say that Christ did sweat drops of blood; but that "his sweat was as it were drops of blood;" to signify, that it was not a slight sweat, and that our Lord's whole body was covered over with large and thick drops of sweat, issuing from it, and falling down to the ground.' In this letter it is likewise, that he observes the omission of this paragraph of St. Luke's gospel in some copies, of which notice was taken by us[y] formerly.

9. In another epistle, considering Rom. ix. 3, "For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ," he observes, 'the[z] apostle does not say, "I wish," but, "I could wish," if it were possible:' and afterwards, 'I[a] could wish, if it were fit, if it were lawful, and if my fall and misery might be beneficial to others.' This I take to be right; and, so far as I can see, this explication removes all the difficulties of that text.

10. There are many excellent counsels and observations to be found in Photius's epistles.

(1.) In the first epistle, which is addressed to Michael, king of Bulgaria: 'It[b] is one of the commands of Christ, our common Lord, that we should bring forth fruits of righteousness, and not disgrace our faith by our works: so likewise directs Paul, the great master of the church; so Peter, the chief of the apostles, who was entrusted with the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and so the whole choir of the apostles taught the world.'

(2.) In the same epistle: 'Some[c] say, it is the main office of a prince to make a small city, or commonwealth, great: but he says, he should esteem it a greater thing to make it good.'

(3.) To the same prince: 'If[d] you receive a benefit, be sure to remember it; if you confer a benefit, you will do well soon to forget it. This is an indication of a great mind, and raiseth the value of the benefit conferred.'

(4.) I refer to two other places concerning[e] friendship and[f] ingratitude.

Θρομβοι αἱματος, ειπων, ᾳ θρομβες ἱδρωσαι απεφηματο αἱματος, κ. λ. Eph. 138. p. 193.

[y] See vol. ii. ch. xxxvi. num. iii. 9.

[z] *Ουδε γαρ ειπεν, Ευχομαι χορισθηναι, αλλ' ηυχομην αν· τατ' εστιν ει δυνατον ην, κ. λ.* Ep. 216. p. 319.

[a] *Ηυχομην αν, ει ενεδεχετο, ει ενεχωρει, ει τις ην αποτασις σωτηριος, κ. λ.* Ib. p. 320.

[b] Ep. i. p. 21. [c] Ep. i. p. 30. [d] Ib. p. 34.

[e] P. 27. [f] P. 37.

CHAP. CLXII.

ŒCUMENIUS.

1. CAVE[a] speaks of Œcumenius as writing about the year 990, but without being certain of his time: and that he has not placed this author too soon, may be argued from Montfaucon's Bibliotheca Coisliniana, who[b] there informs us of a manuscript chain or comment on St. Paul's epistles of the tenth century, in which the name of Œcumenius is mentioned, among other writers out of whom that comment was collected: I therefore place him a little higher, but still in the same century.

2. Montfaucon[c] assures us, from a passage found in a manuscript of the tenth or eleventh century, that Œcumenius was bishop of Tricca in Thessaly; which was not known before.

3. We[d] have Commentaries of this writer upon the Acts, St. Paul's fourteen epistles, and the seven catholic epistles. The Commentaries upon the epistles, if not also upon the Acts, are a chain, consisting of notes and observations of several, beside his own; as John Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, Gregory Nazianzen, Isidore of Pelusium, Theodoret, Photius, and others. At the end of the second volume of Œcumenius is placed the Commentary of Arethas upon the Revelation.

4. In this work, in the edition at Paris, in 1631, which I make use of, the books of the New Testament are placed in the order now generally used; first the Acts of the Apostles, next St. Paul's fourteen epistles, and then the catholic epistles: but there is prefixed to those Commentaries a short copy of verses, representing the contents of

[a] Œcumenius, scriptor admodum incertæ ætatis, de quo altum apud veteres silentium. Id modo constat, post annum 800 claruisse. Adeoque hoc loco ipsum reponimus ad annum 990, donec veram ejus ætatem expiscari liceat. H. L. T. ii. p. 112.

[b] Bib. Cois. p. 82. M.

[c] Vid. Bib. Coisl. in Præf. et p. 277.

[d] In Acta apostolorum catenæ vicem exhibit Œcumenii, incertæ ætatis scriptoris, sed judicio ac perspicuitate commendabilis, Commentarius, qui cum ejusdem Commentariis similibus in epistolas septem catholicas, epistolas sancti Pauli apostoli, et cum Arethâ in Apocalypsin, prodiit Græce Veronæ typis luculentis 1532. fol. Hæc editio mihi ad manus est. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. vii. p. 788. Vid. eund. T. xiii. p. 845.

the whole work, in this manner: 'The [c] book of the Acts, written by Luke; the epistle of James, written to believing Hebrews; the first epistle of Peter, written to believers; the second epistle of Peter, also written to christians; three epistles of John, one of Jude, to all christians in general; then St. Paul's fourteen epistles, all enumerated in our present order: lastly, John's mysterious Revelation.' This, I suppose, was the order of the books, particularly of the Acts and the epistles, in the manuscript; it is also the order observed in the first printed edition of these Commentaries, in Greek only, at Verona in 1532, described by [f] Fabricius, which I likewise have. As for the Commentary upon the Revelation by Arethas, in all probability it was added to make a full volume: moreover, Arethas might be reckoned to be very little distant in time from [g] Œcumenius.

5. James Le Long says, that [h] Œcumenius wrote a Commentary also upon the four gospels; and that he himself says so; but I do not find it in the place to which Le Long refers.

6. Whether Œcumenius received or wrote Commentaries upon the Revelation, will be considered by and by.

7. Upon St. Luke's introduction to the Acts, "The former treatise have I made, O Theophilus," Œcumenius observes, 'He [i] calls it a treatise, and not a gospel, avoiding ostentation; as indeed do the rest likewise. Matthew says, "The book of the generation of Jesus Christ;" Mark indeed says, "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ;" but he does not, by "gospel," intend his own writing, but Christ's preaching. The faithful afterwards called them gospels, as truly containing the gospel, that is, the doctrine of Christ.'

8. Upon Acts xiii. 13, he says, 'This [k] John, who is also called Mark, nephew to Barnabas, wrote the gospel entitled

[c] Των Πραξεων ἡ βιβλος, ἁς Λϐκας γραφει·
Πετοις Ἑβραιων ἐξ Ιακωϐϐ λογοι.
Πετοις ὁ Πετρος πρωτα συνταττει ταδε.
Χριστωνυμοισι δευτεροι Πετρϐ λογοι.
— — — — —
Κλητοις ἁπασι ταυτα μυτης Ιϐδας.
— — — — —
Ιωαννϐ μυησις ἡ κεκρυμμενη.

[f] See before, note [d]. [g] See before, p. 103.

[h] —— 1. Annotationum Commentarii in quatuor Evangelia, ex dictis veterum patrum Græcorum; quos commentarios in epistolam ad Hebræos, cap. 6. se scripsisse testatur. J. Le Long. B. T. ii. p. 883.

[i] Λογον ειπε πρωτον, ϗκ ευαγγελιον, κ. λ. In Act. Ap. T. i. p. 1, 2.

[k] Ibid. p. 111. C.

according to him, and was also disciple of Peter, of whom he says, in his epistle, "Mark, my son, saluteth you."

9. Upon Acts xv. 13. 'This[l] James, appointed bishop of Jerusalem by the Lord, was son of Joseph the carpenter, and brother of our Lord Jesus Christ according to the flesh.'

10. I need not put down the prefaces to St. Paul's several epistles, in which are observed the places where they were written, sometimes right, sometimes wrong.

11. Upon those words of Col. iv. 16, "the epistle from Laodicea," is a note of Photius. Some[m] say, 'this was not an epistle of Paul to them, but from them to him; for he does not say, the epistle to the Laodiceans, but the epistle from Laodicea.'

12. In the argument or preface to the epistle of James, it[n] is said to be written to those of the twelve tribes scattered abroad, who had believed in our Lord Jesus Christ.

13. The argument to the first epistle of Peter says, 'it is[o] written to the believing Jews scattered abroad in several places.'

14. Upon 2 Pet. iii. 1, he observes, as I understand him, to this effect: 'Hence[p] we perceive that Peter wrote only two epistles.'

15. In a note upon the beginning of St. John's second epistle he says, 'Some[q] had thought that this and the following epistle were not written by John the apostle, but by another of the same name, who calls himself Elder.' Our author, however, receives both these, as well as the first.

16. Jude's[r] epistle is said to be written to believers.

17. In a note upon the first epistle to the Corinthians, the[s] Revelation is quoted as written by John the evangelist.

18. As a farther proof, that Œcumenius received the book of the Revelation, I refer to an anecdote, published by Montfaucon, of which[t] he speaks very magnificently in his preface to the Coislinian library; but when he sets about translating the passage, he says, it[u] is written in so obscure a style as to be scarce intelligible.

[l] P. 122. C.
[m] T. ii. p. 146. B.
[n] T. ii. p. 438.
[o] Ib. p. 479.
[p] Εκ τετων μανθανομεν, δυο τας πασας ειναι τε Πετρε επιστολας. p. 548. D.
[q] P. 605.
[r] P. 619. A.
[s] Ὁ ευαγγελιστης Ιωαννης φησιν εν τη Αποκαλυψει. T. i. p. 578. C.
[t] Vigesimum quartum ex eodem codice prodit, estque longe præstantius opusculum Œcumenii, episcopi Triccæ in Thessaliâ. Notes velim, antehac, cujus civitatis episcopus esset Œcumenius, ignotum fuisse. Is auctoritate patrum, ineluctabilibusque argumentis, probat Apocalypsin esse veram et canonicam scripturam. Præf.
[u] Sequens autem opusculum stylo

It is said to be 'the[v] Synopsis of the labours of the blessed Œcumenius, bishop of Tricca, upon the Revelation of John the divine;' and it begins in this manner: 'That[w] this writing is the mystical instruction of the disciple who rested in the bosom of Jesus, and is divinely inspired, and useful, as has been indisputably proved; and that it is not spurious, as some have profanely said, but a genuine writing of the son of thunder:' and the author then proceeds to argue this from the testimonies of Athanasius, Basil, Gregory, Methodius, Cyril of Alexandria, Hippolytus, and from other considerations.

19. I shall now make a few remarks. First, from the passage above cited from the Commentary upon the epistle to the Corinthians, it appears to be probable, that Œcumenius received the book of the Revelation; and this passage may be allowed to afford some additional evidence. Nevertheless, secondly, this writer being unknown and anonymous, what he says cannot be admitted as full proof that Œcumenius ever wrote a Commentary upon the Revelation. Thirdly, the argument for the genuineness of the Revelation, here ascribed to Œcumenius, is much the same with what is to be found in the prefaces of[x] Andrew, and[y] Arethas, to their Commentaries upon that book.

CHAP. CLXIII.

THEOPHYLACT.

1. THEOPHYLACT, archbishop of the chief city of Bulgaria, wrote Commentaries upon the four gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, and St. Paul's fourteen epistles. He is spoken of by Cave[a] as flourishing about the year 1077, by

tam perplexo scriptum est, ut vix intelligi possit. Aliquot etiam in locis vitiatum videtur. Ipsum tamen pro facultate meâ Latine interpretari studui. Bibl. Coisl. p. 277.

[v] Εκ των Οικυμενιω τω μακαριω επισκοπω Τρικκης Θεσσαλιας Θεοφιλως πεπονημενων εις την Αποκαλυψιν Ιωαννυ τυ Θεολογυ, συνοψις σχολικη, κ. λ. Ib. p. 277. F.

[w] P. 277. F. et 278.

[x] See before in this work, vol. ii. p. 124, Andrew cited from Prolog. ad Apoc. p. 3. B. ad Calc. T. viii. Opp. S. Chrysostom. Ed. Morell.

[y] Vid. Areth. ap. Œcumen. T. ii. p. 640.

[a] H. L. T. ii. p. 153.

Fabricius[b] about 1070. His Commentaries[c] are collected out of Chrysostom and others, with observations likewise, undoubtedly, of his own.

2. Beside these works, he is said to have written likewise a Commentary upon the twelve lesser prophets, mentioned by Cave in the place before referred to, and more particularly by[d] Fabricius: but I have not seen it; and whether it has been yet published I cannot certainly say.

3. I proceed directly to take notice of divers things in his Commentaries upon the books of the New Testament.

4. In his preface to St. Matthew's gospel he says, 'that[e] Christ has given us four gospels.' And[f] that there are four evangelists, two of which, Matthew and John, were of the choir of the twelve apostles: the other two, Mark and Luke, were of the number of the Seventy. Mark was a companion and disciple of Peter, Luke of Paul. Matthew first wrote a gospel in the Hebrew language, for the sake of the Hebrew believers, eight years after Christ's ascension; and John, as is said, translated it out of Hebrew into Greek. Mark wrote ten years after our Lord's ascension, having been instructed by Peter; Luke fifteen; and John, the[g] most excellent divine, two[h] and thirty years after our Lord's ascension; for it is said, that when he had outlived them, after their death their three gospels were brought to him, that he might judge whether what they had written was true. Having seen them, he added some things omitted by them: and whereas they had not taken notice of the eternal existence of God the Word, he[i] gave an account of his divinity, lest he should be esteemed a mere man; for Matthew discourseth only of his nativity according to the

[b] Bib. Gr. T. vi. p. 284, &c. [c] Du Pin, Bibl. T. viii. p. 113. R. Simon Hist. Crit. des Comment. du N. T. ch. 28. p. 390, &c. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. vii. p. 787.

[d] Theophylacti, Bulgarorum Archiepiscopi, qui circa A. C. 1070 claruit, Commentarios in xii prophetas minores, ex antiquiorum patrum monumentis decerptos, brevi in lucem edendos speramus a C. V. Johanne Henrico Lederbino, Linguarum Orientalium in Academiâ Argentoratensi Professore, qui illos ex Græco codice Bibl. publicæ illius urbis descripsit, et utrâque linguâ vulgaturum recepit. B. Gr. T. vii. p. 765.

[e] *Τεσσαρα δε δεδωκεν ἡμιν εναγγελια.* Pr. in Matt. p. 1. B. Paris. 1631.

[f] *Τεσσαρες μεν εισιν οἱ εναγγελισται· τετων οἱ μεν δυο—ησαν εκ τε χορε των δωδεκα· οἱ δε δυο, Μαρκος φημι και Λεκας, εκ των ἑβδομηκοντα, κ. λ.* Ib. p. 2. D. E. p. 3. A. [g] *Θεολογικωτατος.*

[h] According to that account, St. John's gospel was written in the year of our Lord's nativity 65, or thereabout, before the destruction of Jerusalem, and before the siege of that city was begun; which is different from the sentiments of more early writers.

[i] —— *αυτος εθεολογησε* ——

flesh, because he wrote for the Hebrews, who were fully satisfied, when they had been assured that the Christ was born of David and Abraham.'

5. The preface to St. Mark is to this purpose: 'The[k] gospel according to Mark was written at Rome, ten years after Christ's ascension, at the request of the believers there: for this Mark was a disciple of Peter, whom he calls his son spiritually. His name was John. He was nephew to Barnabas, and[l] was also a companion of Paul.'

6. In this same preface[m] he mentions the symbols of the evangelists: but differently from many others. The gospel of John, in the first place, he supposes to be resembled by the face of a lion, the king of beasts, denoting John's pre-eminence: Matthew's by the face of a man. Mark he compares to an eagle, because he begins with the history of John, who was a prophet; and the gift of prophecy is far-sighted. Luke he compares to a calf or ox.

7. In the Commentary upon Acts xii. 12, where John, surnamed Mark, is mentioned, he says, 'Perhaps[n] this is Mark the evangelist, by whom, as is said, Peter evangelized; for Mark's gospel is said to be Peter's:' and he thinks that opinion probable.

8. In the preface to his Commentary upon St. Luke, Theophylact expresseth himself as if he thought the evangelist, in the introduction, referred[o] to the gospels according to the Egyptians, and according to the twelve. He also says, that[p] from that introduction it appears, Luke was not from the beginning a disciple, but only afterwards; for others were disciples from the beginning, as Peter, and the sons of Zebedee, who 'delivered' to him the things which he had not seen or heard.

9. This seems to be contrary to what was said in the preface to St. Matthew's gospel, that Mark and Luke were of the number of the seventy; unless he can be understood to mean some things only, even in the more early part of Christ's ministry, about which Luke might be informed by those disciples, who then attended upon the Lord. It is also said, in the argument of Luke's gospel, that[q] he was

[k] In Marc. ib. p. 189. —αλλα και Παυλȣ συνεκδημος.

[m] P. 190. A. B. [n] Ταχα ὁυτος εςι Μαρχος ὁ ευαγγελιςης. κ. λ. In Act. Ap. p. 115. M. Coloniæ. 1568.

[o] Πολλοι γαρ συνεγραψαν ευαγγελια δηθεν· οἱον εςι το κατ' Αιγυπτιȣς, και το επιγραφομενον των δωδεκα, κ. λ. Pr. in Luc. p. 297. B.

[p] Ib. p. 297, 298. [q] — ὡςε φασι τινες, ἐνα και αυτον γενεσθαι των ἑβδομηκοντα αποςολων· και εκ νεκρων δε αναςαντι τῳ Χριςῳ συναντησαι μετα Κλεοπα.—Γραφει δε προς Θεοφιλον, συγκλητικον οντα και

said to have been one of Christ's seventy apostles, and, after the Lord's resurrection, to have met him with Cleophas. Here likewise he says, that Theophilus, to whom St. Luke wrote, was a man of senatorian rank, and possibly a governor; forasmuch as he calls him 'most excellent,' the same title which St. Paul useth in his addresses to Felix and Festus.

10. In his comment upon the history of the two disciples whom Jesus met in the way to Emmaus, one of whom is said to be Cleophas, Luke xxiv. 18, Theophylact says, some[r] have thought the other to be Luke the evangelist, who, out of modesty, declined to mention himself. Here again St. Luke is supposed to have been personally acquainted with the Lord Jesus.

11. In the preface to St. John's gospel, Theophylact says, 'that[s] John wrote his gospel when[t] he was an exile in Patmos, two and thirty years after Christ's ascension.' He proceeds: 'John[u] was beloved above all the disciples, because of his simplicity, and meekness, and mildness, and purity, for he was a virgin; moreover he was related to the Lord. But how can that be? Attend. Joseph, husband of the blessed Mary, had seven children by a former wife; four sons, and three daughters, Martha, [perhaps it should be Mary,] Esther, and Salome, whose son John was; therefore Salome was reckoned our Lord's sister, and John was his nephew:' so Theophylact in that place. In another place[v] he says, Joseph had by the widow of his brother Cleophas, who died without issue, six children, four sons, and two daughters, named Mary, who[w] was reckoned daughter of Cleophas according to law, and Salome: and he always supposeth[x] Mary, mother of our Lord, to be the same as Mary the mother of James and Joses, who were Joseph's children by a former wife; as was also Salome, the mother

αρχοντα ισως· το γαρ κρατιστος επι των αρχοντων και ηγεμονων ελεγετο· ως και ο Παυλος φησι προς τον ηγεμονα Φηστον· κρατιστε Φηστε. p. 293.

[r] P. 539. C.

[s] — *ο και συνεγραψεν εν Πατμῳ τῃ νησῳ εξοριστος διατελων, κ. λ.* p. 554. B.

[t] So likewise in the latter part of the Synopsis ascribed to Athanasius, it is said, 'The gospel according to John was dictated by the holy and beloved 'apostle, when he was an exile in Patmos, and was afterwards published by 'him at Ephesus, under the care of Gaius his host, and of the other apostles, 'of whom Paul says in the epistle to the Romans [xvi. 23.] "Gaius my host, 'and of the whole church, saluteth you."' Ap. Ath. T. ii. p. 202. F.

[u] P. 554. B. C. D.

[v] In Matth. cap. xiii. p. 79. C. D.

[w] *Την Μαριαν, ἡ ελεγετο τϐ Κλοπα θυγατηρ κατα τον νομον και την Σαλωμην.* Ibid.

[x] Vid. in Matth. cap. xxvii. p 178. C. D. In Marc. cap. xv. p. 286. C. D. in Luc. cap. xxiv. p. 538. D. In Joan. cap. xix. p. 826. C. D.

of Zebedee's children. And whereas in John xix. 25, mention is made of Mary, wife or daughter of Cleophas, and 'sister' to our Lord's mother, he says, that[y] by 'sister' must be there understood 'relation;' for that Mary is supposed to be daughter of Cleophas, brother of Joseph, whose widow he had married.

11. Theophylact says, there[z] was this very extraordinary in John the evangelist, that he had three mothers; his own mother Salome, and Thunder, and the blessed Mary, forasmuch as the Lord said to him, "Behold thy mother," John xix. 27.

12. He likewise says, that[a] there are four Marys mentioned in the gospels: our Lord's mother, Mary Magdalene, Mary daughter of Cleophas, and the sister of Lazarus.

13. In the argument or preface to the Acts of the Apostles Theophylact says, the[b] writer is Luke, native of Antioch, by profession a physician. He here also says, that[c] Paul wrote fourteen epistles: and indeed our author has explained them all.

14. I need not give a particular account of his several prefaces to St. Paul's epistles: I observe a few things only.

15. He says, the[d] epistle to the Ephesians was written by the apostle Paul at Rome, when he was a prisoner.

16. Upon Coloss. iv. 14, he says, that[e] Luke, the physician there mentioned, is the evangelist; but he does not there say that he was a native or citizen of Antioch.

17. Upon Col. iv. 16, he writes, 'that[f] (or 'which') is the epistle from Laodicea? It is the first epistle to Timothy, for that was written from Laodicea. But some say it is an epistle which the Laodiceans had sent to Paul; though I do not know what they have to justify this opinion.' From all which it may be reckoned very probable, that Theophylact had never heard of any epistle of Paul to the Laodiceans.

18. The epistle of St. James is several times quoted in Theophylact's Commentaries: he quotes it[g] expressly as written by James, the Lord's brother.

19. I need not say he received the first epistle of St. Peter.

[y] Ib. p. 826. B. C.

[z] *Μονος γαρ ουτος τρεις μητερας αναφαινεται εχων, την φυσικην την Σαλωμην, την βροντην, υιος γαρ βροντης δια ευαγγελιε μεγαλοφωνιαν, και την Θεοτοκον, κ. λ.* In Joh. p. 554. D. E.

[a] — *ἡ Θεοτοκος—δευτερα ἡ Μαγδαληνη, τριτη ἡ τε Κλεοπα, και τεταρτη ἡ τε Λαζαρε αδελφη.* In Jo. p. 826.

[b] Comment. in Act. Ap. p. 1. Colon. 1568.

[c] Ibid. p. 3.

[d] In Ep. Paul. Comm. p. 498. Londin. 1636.

[e] Ib. p. 675.

[f] P. 676.

[g] In Evangel. p. 218. C.

20. He once quotes St. John's first epistle in this manner: 'For[h] he says in one of his epistles, "That which was from the beginning, which we have seen."' Therefore he received more than one.

21. It is probable that Theophylact received all the seven catholic epistles.

22. But I cannot say that he received the book of the Revelation: I do not remember that he has any where quoted it; which, I think, he would have done, if it had been of authority with him. However I put in the margin[i] a reference or two, to be considered by those who please; but I do not reckon them very material. Perhaps he was of the same opinion with St. Chrysostom concerning the book of the Revelation.

23. Theophylact quotes no forged christian writings of apocryphal books of the New Testament. He cuts off a good number of them by that observation upon John i. 31—34, that[k] Christ wrought no miracle in his infancy, or before the time of his public ministry; about which he is clear and positive. We formerly saw a like observation in[l] Chrysostom.

24. He seldom quotes any apocryphal books of the Old Testament. A passage of Ecclesiasticus is cited[m] as the saying of a wise man.

25. I shall now take a few remarkable passages.

26. In the preface to St. Matthew's gospel: 'And[n] was not one evangelist sufficient? Yes. Nevertheless, for making the truth more manifest, four were permitted to write: for when you see these four not conferring together, nor meeting in the same place, but separate from each other, writing the same things as with one mouth, are you not led to admire the truth of the gospel, and to say that they spake by the Holy Ghost? Do not say to me that they do not agree in every thing; for wherein do they differ? Does one say that Christ was born, and another not? or does one say that he rose from the dead, and another that he did not rise? By no means; for they agree in the necessary and principal things: and if they do not differ in the principal things, why should you wonder that they vary in

[h] *Φησι γαρ εν μια των αυτω επιστολων. Ὁ ην απ' αρχης, ὁ ἑωρακαμεν.* Ib. p. 555. C.

[i] Vid. in Matth. cap. xxii. p. 128. E. In Marc. cap. ii. p. 201. B.

[k] *Εντευθεν δε μανθανομεν, ὁτι τα λεγομενα παιδικα τω Χριστω θαυματα ψευδη εισι, και παρα των θελοντων διαγελασθαι το μυστηριον συντεθεμενα. Ει γαρ ησαν αληθη, πως ηγνοειτο ποιων ταυτα ὁ Κυριος.* In Jo. c. i. p. 576. E.

[l] See vol. iv. ch. cxviii. num. xv.

[m] *Φησι γαρ και σοφος, κ. λ.* In Luc. c. xiv. p. 437. C.

[n] In Matth. p. 3.

lesser matters? For that very reason they are the more credible, in that they do not agree in all things; for then it would have been thought that they had met and consulted together: but now one has written what another has omitted, and therefore they seem to differ in some things.' This should be compared with a passage of Chrysostom[o] formerly transcribed.

27. Upon Matth. ii. 11, he says, When[p] the child was born, the Virgin laid him in a stable, not finding any house to be in. But afterwards he thinks it likely they found room in a house, and there the magians of the east found him.

28. Upon Matth. v. 44: 'To[q] love some men, and those our friends, and hate others, is a mark of imperfection: he is perfect who loves all men.'

29. He[r] finely explains those words of our Lord, Mark x. 40, "It is not mine to give, but it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared;" and his observations upon this place may be compared with what he says upon[s] Matth. xx. 23.

30. Upon Luke xxi. 37, 38: 'Our[t] Lord,' says Theophylact, 'said many excellent things to those who came to him in the temple: and from this and other places, we may conclude therefore, that the evangelists have related a few things only; for though the Lord preached almost three years, if a man should say, that all which they have recorded might be spoken in the compass of one day, he would not speak much beside the truth.'

For certain, the evangelical writings, in which conciseness and fulness are united, deserve the highest commendations.

From that passage it appears that Theophylact did not compute our Saviour's ministry to have lasted three years and more, but somewhat less than three years: accordingly, he does not suppose the Jewish feast, mentioned by St. John, v. 1, to have been a passover, but[u] some other feast, possibly pentecost, as he conjectures. Of this point I have spoken[v] formerly.

31. The section concerning the woman taken in adultery, which we have in John viii. at the beginning, is not explained by[w] Theophylact.

32. I now beg leave to mention a general observation.

[o] See vol. iv. chap. cxviii. num. xviii.
[p] P. 13. E.
[q] P. 33. E.
[r] P. 249. B. C.
[s] P. 117, 118.
[t] P. 509. B. C.
[u] P. 623. B.
[v] See vol. ii. ch. xxxvi. num. iii.
[w] Vid. p. 674.

Theophylact's Commentaries are very useful and valuable: but it seems to me, that too much respect has been shown to his prefaces to the four gospels, where he determines the times of the several evangelists' writing. Just and useful observations, right or probable interpretations of scripture, may be received from any man, let him live when he will, but, as an historian, the testimony of a man, who speaks of things done a thousand years before his time, is of little value, unless it be derived from more ancient writers. Mill, in his Prolegomena, says, that[x] Theophylact is the first who has assigned the precise year in which each evangelist published his gospel; and yet he has placed Theophylact's prefaces, where those determinations are made, at the head of the several gospels in his edition, without any remarks; and many have followed Theophylact in that point, though Mill had more judgment: but the early date of the gospels is popular, and it has become almost a general opinion. Upon this point some observations were mentioned[y] in the chapter of Eusebius of Cæsarea.

CHAP. CLXIV.

EUTHYMIUS.

1. EUTHYMIUS[a] was a monk who lived at Constantinople in the latter part of the eleventh and the beginning of the twelfth century. He wrote a work entitled Panoplia, against all heretics; Commentaries upon the Psalms, and upon the gospels, collected chiefly out of Chrysostom and other ancient writers; and also some other books. His works are not yet published in the original Greek, that I know of, but only in Latin versions; though Mill, and R. Simon, and

[x] Theophylactus hic noster, omnium (quod sciam) primus, designat ipsum præcise annum, quo evangelistæ singuli sua conscripserint evangelia. Matthæum evangelium suum scripsisse ait anno post ascensionem Christi octavo; Marcum decimo; Lucam decimo quinto; Joannem trigesimo secundo. Et ad hujus calculum se componunt MSS. plurimi in notatis ad calcem evangeliorum. Mill. Prol. n. 1072.

[y] See vol. iv. p. 133—135.

[a] Vid. Cav. H. L. T. ii. Du Pin, Bibl. des Aut. Ec. T. ix. p. 197. Fabr. Bib. Gr. l. v. c. 11. T. vii. p. 460, &c. R. Simon Hist. Critic. des commentat. du N. T. ch. 29. p. 469, &c.

some others, who had access to manuscripts, have quoted several passages from him in Greek.

2. In his preface to St. Matthew's gospel he says, 'that[b] Matthew wrote at the request of the Jewish believers in Judea.' He seems to say in the same place, that Mark wrote his gospel at the request of the believers in Egypt. He likewise says, that[c] Matthew's gospel was first written, and in Judea, for the Jewish believers, in Hebrew, eight years after our Lord's ascension: afterwards his gospel was translated into the Greek language.

3. The[d] evangelist Mark he supposeth to be the nephew of Barnabas, often mentioned in the Acts and St. Paul's epistles; he supposeth him likewise to be the same who is mentioned by Peter at the end of his first epistle. He says his gospel was written about ten years after our Lord's ascension, at Rome, as some said, or in Egypt, according to others. He says, that at the first Mark was much with his uncle Barnabas, and Paul: afterwards he was with Peter at Rome, as the first epistle of that apostle shows, whom he also there calls his son; from whom also he received the whole history of the gospel.

4. If Mark was at first much with Barnabas and Paul, and not with Peter till afterwards, that does not favour the supposition, that his gospel was written within ten years after our Lord's ascension; for, according to the general and almost universally concurring testimony of ancient authors, Mark received his gospel from the apostle Peter, as is also said by this writer himself.

5. Having explained St. Mark's gospel to the end of ver.

[b] Matthæum enim, qui ex Judæis crediderant, obsecraverunt, ut scriptam relinqueret ipsis evangelii historiam, quam eos verbo docuerat. Similiter et Marcum, qui in Ægypto edocti fuerant. Euthym. in iv. Evangelia, ap. Bib. PP. Max. T. xix. p. 487. G.

[c] Primus autem scripsit Matthæus quod nunc præ manibus est evangelium, post octo annos Christi in cœlos assumpti. Scripsit autem ad illos, qui ex Judæis crediderant, ut prædiximus, Hebræâ usus linguâ ac contexturâ. Postea vero in nostram linguam traductum est. Id. ib. p. 488. A. Conf. Testimonia, ap. Mill. N. T.

[d] Marcus, filius Mariæ, quæ in domo suâ benigne apostolos excipiebat. Vocabatur autem et Joannes, quemadmodum in Actis Apostolorum invenimus. —Et circa principia quidem conjunctus est Barnabæ avunculo suo, et Paulo, sicuti liber Actorum testatur, et Paulus in epistolis mentionem faciens. Deinde cum Petro Romæ conversatus est, quemadmodum prior ejus epistola demonstrat, quâ etiam filium suum juxta spiritum Marcum appellavit. A quo insuper totum evangelii sermonem didicit, et postmodum evangelium conscripsit, secundum Clementem Stromaticum, in ipsâ Româ; juxta Chrysostomum autem in Ægypto, rogatus a fratribus, qui ibidem morabantur, post decimum a Salvatoris assumtione annum. Ibid. p. 597. G. H.

8th of the 16th chapter, he says, 'Some[e] expositors affirm this to be the conclusion of Mark's gospel, and that what follows has been added since: nevertheless it ought to be explained by us, as it contains nothing contrary to truth.'

6. Luke,[f] he says, was a native of Antioch, and a physician. He was a hearer of Christ, and, as some say, one of his seventy disciples, as well as Mark; he was afterwards very intimate with Paul. He wrote his gospel, with Paul's permission, fifteen years after our Lord's ascension.

7. He says, that[g] St. John's gospel was not written until many years after the destruction of Jerusalem.

8. Of the noted various reading in St. John's gospel he expresseth himself after this manner. Having explained ch. vii. 52, he adds, 'It[h] ought to be observed, that what follows here to those words, "then spake Jesus again unto them, saying, I am the light of the world," are either wanting in the more exact copies, or marked with a dagger in the margin, denoting them to be spurious and interpolated: of which it is some argument, that this place is not explained by former interpreters; nevertheless, as it may be useful, we shall explain it.'

[e] Quidam autem interpretum asserunt, hoc in loco completum esse Marci evangelium, quæ vero sequuntur recentiorem esse additionem. Oportet tamen et hanc explanare, quum veritati nihil repugnet. p. 614. B.

[f] Beatus Lucas Antiochensis fuit genere. Omnem autem sermonis disciplinam adeptus, medicinam etiam corporum didicit, ac postmodum animarum quoque medicinam assequutus est. Primum, quidem, Christo adhæsit, et ab eo pietatis semina suscepit. Postea vero Paulo duci conjunctus, maximeque familiaris effectus est, ac discipulus ejus, comesque itineris. Dicunt autem quidam, et maxime Origenes, quod Marcus et Lucas ante dominicam passionem inter septuaginta discipulos connumerati sunt. Post quindecim vero annos a Salvatoris assumtione, permissu Pauli, conscripsit evangelium ad Theophilum, fidelissimum, Deique amantissimum. Ibid. p. 615. B.

[g] Præsens autem evangelium multis annis post capta Jerosolyma conscripsit. Ib. p. 663. E.

[h] Scire autem oportet, quod ea quæ ab hoc loco habentur usque ad eum quo dicitur: 'Iterum ergo loquutus est illis Jesus dicens: Ego lux mundi:' in exactioribus exemplaribus aut non inveniuntur, aut obelo confossa sunt, eo quod illegitima videantur et addita. Et hujus argumentum est, quod nullus ea sit interpretatus, &c. Ibid. 690. G.

CHAP. CLXV.

NICEPHORUS CALLISTI.

1. NICEPHORUS, son of Callistus Xanthopulus,[a] a learned monk of Constantinople, is placed by H. Wharton,[b] in his Appendix to Cave, at the year 1333; but as the emperor, to whom his work is dedicated, is[c] computed to have died in 1327, I shall place him a few years sooner, in 1325.

He wrote in the Greek language an Ecclesiastical History in eighteen books, from the nativity of Christ to the year 610, collected, as he says,[d] out of Eusebius of Cæsarea, Socrates, Sozomen, Philostorgius, Theodoret, Euagrius, and others.

2. From him I shall transcribe an article concerning the books of the New Testament, omitting some particulars, which render his narration prolix, and which are not now needful to be taken by us at large, after having seen what is said by Eusebius, and other ecclesiastical writers of former times.

3. In the 45th chapter of the second book of his History he says, 'Thus we have spoken of the twelve apostles, and their names: it[e] is now proper to show, who of them have left writings which are in the Testament; such as the four sacred gospels, the divine Acts of the Apostles, and the catholic epistles, and the rest, and their order; and also such as are spurious, and are rejected by the church. And in the first place, of the divine gospels: two only of the twelve, Matthew and John, have left memoirs of our Lord's life on earth; and two of the Seventy, Mark and Luke; and it is said that they were all compelled to write, as it

[a] Vid Pagi ann. 610. n. vii. Fabric. Bib. Gr. l. v. cap. 4. T. vi. p. 130. &c. Du Pin, Bib. des Aut. Ec. T. xi. p. 98.

[b] Cav. H. L. in App. p. 33.

[c] Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopulus, Callistides, sive Callisti Xanthopuli filius, historiam suam obtulit Andronico Palæologo Imperatori jam seni, qui A. C. 1327, septuagenario major obiit. Fabr. ubi supr. p. 130.

[d] Vid. H. E. L. i. cap. 1. p. 35, 36. Paris. 1630.

[e] *Ὅσοι γε μην συγγραμματα καταλελοιποτες εισιν, ἁ και ὡς ενδιαθηκα κατελεγησαν· ετι δε και περι των ἱερων τεσσαρων ευαγγελιων, των τε θειων πραξεων αποστολικων, και των επιστολων των τε καθολικων, και της ταξεως αυτων, ἐξης μεν ειη δηλον, ὁσα τε νοθα, και τῃ εκκλησιᾳ αποβλητα. Ὑπομνηματα μεν ων των τε Κυριε διατριβων, δυο μονας των δωδεκα ισμεν συγγραψαμενους.* L. ii. c. 45. p. 213.

were out of necessity. Matthew first, who had been a publican, and had preached the saving word to the Jews, when he was about to go abroad among Gentiles, thought it best to write in his native language an account of his preaching, to supply the want of his presence: which he did at about fifteen years after our Saviour's ascension. Long[f] after this, Mark and Luke published their gospels, at the command [or by the direction] of Peter and Paul. John, who had hitherto preached by word of mouth only, wrote the last of all, about six and thirty years after the Lord's ascension to heaven.' [Then he gives an account of the other three gospels having been brought to John, and the reasons which induced John to write another gospel after them.] 'These[g] are the genuine gospels of the apostles, delivered to us from the beginning, and acknowledged by the whole church to be of unquestioned authority. The same Luke also composed the book of the Acts of the Apostles, and, as is said, at the command of Paul.—The divine James, the Lord's brother, composed one of the catholic epistles, which is sent to the twelve tribes. Peter published two epistles, and the excellent John three: Jude, brother of James, and perhaps of the Lord likewise, one. These[h] seven epistles the church has long received as genuine, and readily placeth them among the rightful books of the New Testament. To these are to be added the fourteen epistles of the divine Paul. Lastly, we[i] know the Revelation of John also to have been delivered to the church. All other are spurious and falsely inscribed;' that is, all other, which bear the names of apostles, and thereby make a claim to be a part of sacred scripture.

4. In the next chapter, which is the concluding chapter of that book, he observes, and chiefly as from Eusebius of Cæsarea, 'that some of the ancients had rejected or doubted of divers of the fore-mentioned books. The four gospels were received by all, as also the book of the Acts. The[k] writings, about which there were doubts, are these: the epistle of James the Lord's brother, which is the first of

[f] Χρονῳ δε πολλῳ υστερον. Ib. p. 213. C.

[g] Ταυτα γνησια των αποστολων ευαγγελια, και ανεκωθεν παραδεδομενα, και αναμφηριστα παρα πασης εκκλησιας γινωσκεται. Ὁ δ' αυτος Λουκας και το των αποστολικων Πραξεων βιβλιον συνταττει, ὡς φασι, Παυλου κελευσαντος. Ibid. p. 215. C.

[h] Ἁς δε ἑπτα ουσας, ὡς γνησιας ἡ εκκλησια προσιεται ανωθεν, και εν τοις οικειοις των της νεας διαθηκης βιβλιων εγκρινει ὡς μαλιστα. p. 215. D.

[i] Ὑστατον δε και την του Ιωαννου Αποκαλυψιν επισταμεθα παραδεδομενην τῃ εκκλησιᾳ. Τα δε παρα ταυτα νοθα τε και παρεγγραπτα. Ib. p. 216. A.

[k] Εν αμφιβολοις δ' ησαν, κ. λ. L. ii. c. 46. p. 216. B.

the catholic epistles; and the seventh, which is the epistle of Jude his brother; and the second epistle of Peter. About receiving these, some of the ancients hesitated. Of the three epistles of John one only was received without contradiction; the other two were ascribed by some to another John, an elder, who lived at Ephesus after John. And some have supposed, that the Revelation also was written by the same John. All the epistles of Paul have been unquestioned, except that to the Hebrews. But[l] though there were for a while doubts about these, we know that at length they have been received by all the churches under heaven with a firm assent; and they are esteemed as the inviolable principles and elements of our religion. It is fit also that we should know what are the other writings, which are spurious and falsely inscribed: which he mentions so agreeably to Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History, already transcribed into this work, that there is no necessity to take at length what follows.

5. What we learn from this writer of the fourteenth century is, that all the books of the New Testament, which are now received by us, were generally received then. We have also the satisfaction to find, that there were then no other books whatever, of authority, beside these; which were esteemed 'the inviolable principles and elements of our religion;' or the rule of christian belief and practice; or, as he called them before, and again[m] likewise, 'the books in the Testament,' a word equivalent to canonical, as was formerly observed by[n] us. Moreover, it affords reason to believe, that there never were any other writings received or quoted by christians, as of authority, beside these; which[o] he also calls genuine scriptures of the church: for this studious monk represents here the sentiments of former times, as well as of his own. The genuineness of some of these had been doubted of; but there never were any others of authority beside them.

6. This article of Nicephorus, at the beginning of the fourteenth century, subjoined to all the rest, may serve for a conclusion of this book, as containing a summary account

[l] *Ταυτα μεν ει και αμφιβολα τοις προτερον εδοξαν, αλλ' εν ἁπασαις ες ὑστερον ταις υπ' ωρανον εκκλησιαις το αντιῤῥητον εσχηκοτα εγνωκαμεν· και ὡς αρχαι και στοιχεια της καθ' ἡμας ευσεβειας αιωνια διαμενωσι, κ. λ.* Ib. p. 217. B. C.

[m] *— και τας αλλας αντιλεχθεισας μεν, χρονῳ δε πλειστῳ βεβαιωθεισας, και παρα πασι ταις ενδιαθηκαις καταλεγεισας.* Ibid. p. 218. A.

[n] Vol. iv. p. 141.

[o] *— ὡς αν ταυτας τε ειδεναι εχομεν, ὁσαι γνησιαι της εκκλησιας γραφαι.* Ibid.

of what has been said, and representing what was to be proved; which, I hope, we have proved, and may reasonably put down here, Q. E. D.

APPENDIX.

Containing an account of the Ecclesiastical Histories of Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret.

1. OBSERVING, upon a review, that I have hitherto given no distinct account of the ecclesiastical historians, Socrates and Sozomen, though they have been quoted several times, I shall do it now briefly; referring also to[a] some learned moderns, who may be consulted by those who have leisure.

Both those writers and Theodoret are continuators of Eusebius of Cæsarea: all three flourished in the time of Theodosius the younger, whose reign commenced in 408, and ended in 450; and their histories were all published near the end of that reign. They are very valuable monuments of antiquity; but there are in them many stories of miracles, not well attested, and improbable in their circumstances.

Valesius and many other learned men have supposed that these three historians wrote one after another, first Socrates, then Sozomen, and lastly Theodoret, and that the latter borrowed from the other, and aimed to supply what had been omitted: but to me the opinion of Pagi appears more probable; which is, that[b] they all set about their works

[a] Cav. Hist. Lit. Fabr. Bib. Gr. l. v. cap. 4. T. vi. p. 117—129. H. Vales. de Vit. et Scriptis Socrat. Sozom. et Theodoret. Pagi ann. 427. n. xv. xvi. 429. n. ix. x. xi. Basnag. ann. 439. n. v. 440. n. vii. 430. n. vi. Du Pin, Bib. T. iii. P. ii. Tillem. M. E. T. 15. Theodoret. J. Le Clerc, Bib. A. et. M. T. xvi. p. 103—156.

[b] Socrates, Sozomenus, et Theodoretus, uno eodemque tempore rerum ecclesiasticarum historiam scribere aggressi sunt; idem omnes scribendi principium sumsere, eundemque fere finem historiæ suæ imposuere, ab iis temporibus exorsi, quibus Eusebius historiam suam terminaverat. Pagi Critic. in Baron. ann. 427. n. xv.

—Verum Theodoretus de Socratis et Sozomeni historiâ supplendâ non cogitavit. Sed, cum utroque longe doctior esset, et in Oriente versaretur, in quæ uterque incidit, vitavit: et quia res in Oriente, quam quæ in urbe regiâ gestæ, melius callebat, ideo in illis quam istis fusior et diligentior est. Contra vero Socrates et Sozomenus easdem leviter attigêre. Quare non dubito, quin

severally about the same time, and all published at no great distance of time from each other, near the end of the reign of Theodosius, as before said.

II. Socrates was born and educated[c] at Constantinople: he studied[d] under the grammarians Helladius and Ammonius, both heathens, who, when their temples were destroyed at Alexandria, in 391, left that city, and came to reside at Constantinople. For a while Socrates pleaded causes: afterwards, leaving the bar, he set about writing his Ecclesiastical History, which[e] comprehends, in seven books, the space of about a hundred and three and thirty years, from the year 306, when Constantine was declared emperor, to the seventeenth consulship of Theodosius, or the year of Christ 439; and he is spoken of by Cave as flourishing in that year.

Socrates is particularly esteemed[f] for his judicious observations upon men and things. Every reader of this work is able to form some notion of his judgment, by recollecting the passages that have been alleged from him upon divers[g] occasions; wherein he shows himself to have been a man of great moderation, and an enemy to persecution, which also he defines in this manner: he is speaking of Julian: he says, 'that[h] emperor avoided the excessive cruelty that was 'practised in the times of Dioclesian: nevertheless he per-'secuted; for that I call persecution, when any disturbance 'is given to men that live peaceably and quietly. The

tres isti scriptores, qui omnes sibi idem argumentum proposuere, non solum sub extremis Theodosii Junioris temporibus, quod de Socrate et Sozomeno infra videbitur, sed etiam eodem tempore historias suas ecclesiasticas in lucem emiserint.—Ita non audiendus Valesius in eo quod autumat, ex tribus historiæ ecclesiasticæ scriptoribus alterum alterius scrinia compilâsse, et ex illis eum, qui alteri aliquid addidit, aut alterum interdum emendavit, hunc posteriorem videri scripsisse. Id. ib. n. xvi.

[c] Socrat. l. v. cap. 24.

[d] Ibid. cap. 16.

[e] Vid. lib. vii. cap. ult.

[f] Tandem vero abjectâ causidicinâ, ad scribendam ecclesiasticam historiam se contulit. Quâ in re et judicio et diligentiâ usus est singulari. Ac judicium quidem declarant observationes et sententiæ passim in libris ejus intextæ, quibus, meo judicio, nihil est illustrius. H. Vales. de Vitâ et Scriptis Socrat. et Sozomen.

Sed quantum dictionis elegantiâ vincit Sozomenus, tantum Socrates judicio vincit. Nam Socrates quidem tum de viris, tum de rebus ac negotiis ecclesiasticis, optime judicat. Id. ibid.

[g] See vol. iii. p. 99, 100, 104, 105. Vol. iv. p. 63, &c.

[h] *Και την μεν ὑπερβαλλεσαν επι Διοκλητιανε ωμοτητα υπερεθετο. Ου μην παντη τε διωκειν απεσχετο. Διωγμον δε λεγω το ὁπωσον ταραττειν τες ἡσυχαζοντας. Εταραττε δε ὡδε. Νομῳ εκελευσε χριστιανες παιδευσεως μη μετεχειν.* Socr. l. iii. c. 12.

'particular, in which he instanceth, is Julian's edict, pro-'hibiting christians to read the ancient Greek and Roman 'authors.' And there are in him many other places[i] well worthy of observation; in some of which he makes very free remarks upon the squabbles and contentions of the christian clergy of those times.

Socrates always speaks with great respect of the scriptures of the Old and New Testament, and has expressly quoted[k] the Acts of the Apostles,[l] epistles to the Romans,[m] the Corinthians, the[n] Galatians, Colossians, and Hebrews: he likewise takes notice[o] of a various reading in 1 John iv. 3, or 'John's catholic epistle,' as his expression is; upon which Mill and others may be consulted.

III. Hermias Sozomen[p] was born of reputable parents in Palestine, and in early life was educated in a monastery; afterwards he studied the law at Berytus, and then went to Constantinople, where he was an advocate, and continued to plead causes, whilst[q] at his leisure hours he wrote his Ecclesiastical History: which contains, in nine books, an account of affairs from[r] the third consulship of Crispus and Constantine, Cæsars, to the seventeenth consulship of Theodosius, emperor, in whose time he wrote, and to whom his work is dedicated, that is, from the year 324 to the year 439, or one hundred and fifteen years. He is placed by Cave as flourishing about the year 440.

Beside the history of which I have been speaking, Sozomen[s] had before written, in two books, a summary account of the affairs of the church, from the ascension of Christ to the defeat of Licinius; but that work is not now extant.

Sozomen likewise, as well as Socrates, was a man of moderation, as must have been perceived by all from several passages alleged from him[t] in this work.

It may be also observed of him, that[u] he always speaks with great respect of the sacred scriptures.

[i] Vid. l. v. cap. 22. l. i. c. 24. in c. xxvii. p. 64. B. l. iii. cap. 24. et 25. in. l. iv. cap. 1. et 6. l. v. in Pr.

[k] L. v. cap. 22. p. 288, 289.

[l] L. iii. cap. 16. p. 188. C.

[m] L. iv. cap. 23. p. 232. A.

[n] L. v. cap. 22. p. 283.

[o] *Οτι εν τη καθολικη Ιωαννε γεγραπτο εν τοις παλαιοις αντιγραφοις, ὁτι παν πνευμα, ὁ λυει τον Ιησεν, απο τε Θεε ουκ εστι.* L. vii. cap. 32. p. 374.

[p] Sozom. l. v. cap. 15. p. 617.

[q] Ib. l. ii. cap. 3. p. 446. A. B.

[r] Vid. Sozom. Pr. p. 397.

[s] Vid. l. i. cap. 1. p. 401.

[t] See vol. iii. p. 98, 99. Vol. iv. 63.

[u] Vid. Soz. l. v. cap. 15. p. 617. cap. 21. p. 629. D. l. vii. cap. 12. p. 718. C. l. vii. cap. 19. p. 735. A.

What he says of the Revelation of Peter and the Revelation of Paul, was taken notice of[v] formerly.

IV. THEODORET wrote, in five books, the history of things from[w] the rise of the Arian controversy, or where Eusebius left off, to the death of Theodore, bishop of Mopsuestia, that is, from the year of Christ 324 to 429, being the space of one hundred and five years.

Theodoret's testimony to the scriptures was exhibited[x] formerly.

[v] See vol. iv. p. 132.
[w] Vid. Theodoret. H. E. l. i. cap. 1. et 2. et l. v. cap. ult.
[x] See p. 14, &c. of this volume.

A

GENERAL REVIEW

OF

THIS WHOLE WORK,

ESPECIALLY OF

THE SECOND PART.

THE design of this work, from the beginning, and all along, has been, to show the truth of the evangelical history, and thereby the truth of the christian religion; for if the facts related in the gospels, and confirmed by the epistles of the New Testament, may be relied upon, the christian religion is from Heaven.

The things there related to have been done by Jesus, and by his disciples by virtue of powers derived from him, must be allowed to afford good proof that he came from God, and that his doctrine is true and divine: and as Jesus, in the circumstances of his birth, life, and death, and exaltation, and in the success and progress of the principles taught by him, answers the description of the great person foretold and promised in the Old Testament, he is at the same time shown to be the Messiah.

In the former part of this work the facts occasionally mentioned in the New Testament were confirmed by passages of ancient authors; and a long deduction there is in that part of various particulars concerning the estate and character of the princes and governors, in whose time these things are said to have happened, and concerning the state of the Jews at that time in Judea, and out of it, and their religious opinions, customs, and practices, as also of other people to whom the apostles went; all found to be agree-

able to the accounts of Josephus and Philo, and many heathen authors of the best note, and contemporary with our Saviour and his apostles, or living very near their time.

We have supposed this to be a very cogent argument, that the books of the New Testament were written before, or soon after, the destruction of Jerusalem, which happened in the 70th year of the christian æra.

And if these books were written by persons who lived before the destruction of Jerusalem, that is, if they were written at the time in which they are supposed to have been written, the things related in them are true and incontestable. The force of this argument may be seen represented in the conclusion of that part.

Consequently, the former part of this work, though it immediately and directly concerned only those facts which are occasionally mentioned in the New Testament, affords a very forcible argument for the truth of the principal facts of the New Testament; by which all know to be intended the miraculous though mean birth of Jesus, and all the wonders of his life and ministry, his death, resurrection, and ascension; the effusion of the Holy Ghost upon his apostles afterwards, their preaching in his name the doctrine received from him, and confirming it by miraculous works, and planting the gospel, and forming, in a short space of time, churches of disciples at Jerusalem, and in all the parts of Judea, and in many other cities and countries.

In this second part we have proceeded to show more directly the truth of the evangelical history, by producing testimonies to the antiquity, genuineness, and authority of the books of the New Testament, now generally received by christians, as containing an authentic account of the religion taught by Christ and his apostles.

And in this book is a history of all, or almost all, the catholic writers of the first four centuries, and of the principal christian writers of the following centuries, to the beginning of the twelfth; with an article, by way of conclusion, from Nicephorus Callisti, a learned author at the beginning of the fourteenth century, containing a summary account of all that has been said, and representing what was to be proved; which, I hope, has been proved.

And whoever is desirous to know what books were received as sacred scripture, by any writers of the church in past ages, may here find a distinct account of it in the chapters that bear their names.

1. As we are now to review this book, the first observation which offers is this: We have seen a goodly catalogue

of eminent men, who have believed in Jesus as the Christ, and their Lord and Master, whose religion was not set up with worldly allurements. Says Jerom, in the prologue to his book of Ecclesiastical writers, 'Let[a] the enemies of our 'religion, who say the church had no philosophers, nor 'eloquent and learned men, observe who and what they 'were who founded, established, and adorned it: let them 'cease to accuse our faith of rusticity, and confess their mis-'take.' So said Jerom with regard to Celsus, Porphyry, and Julian, who had been the most noted adversaries of the christian religion in the first four centuries. The same may be still said to those called deists in our time. And may I not add, Let those conceited christians, who unmeasurably despise the primitive times of christianity, learn to pay some respect to their christian ancestors, in whom both learning, and an honest, fervent zeal, were united. They are not the rule of our faith, but they have directed us to the sacred scriptures, where it may be found: and they have borne testimony to the truth of the things contained therein, by an open and stedfast profession, amidst a great variety of difficulties and discouragements, reproaches and sufferings.

And though every one who has read this work is able to supply a fuller catalogue, I shall here also rehearse in part the names of eminent christians of the early ages, from an epistle of the same masterly hand to Magnus, a Roman orator, upon a different occasion. 'Jerom,[b] having at the begin-

[a] Discant ergo Celsus, Porphyrius, Julianus, rabidi adversus Christum canes; discant eorum sectatores, qui putant ecclesiam nullos philosophos, et eloquentes, nullos habuisse doctores, quanti et quales viri eam fundaverint, exstruxerint, et adornaverint, et desinant fidem nostram rusticæ tantum simplicitatis arguere, suamque potius imperitiam agnoscant. Proleg. in. libr. de Scr. Ec.

[b] Curram per singulos. Quadratus, apostolorum discipulus, et Atheniensis pontifex ecclesiæ, nonne Adriano principi, Eleusinæ sacra visenti, librum pro nostrâ religione tradidit? et tantæ admirationi omnibus fuit, ut persecutionem gravissimam illius sedaret ingenium. Aristides philosophus, vir eloquentissimus, eidem principi apologeticum pro christianis obtulit, contextum philosophorum sententiis. Quem imitatus postea Justinus, et ipse philosophus, Antonino Pio et filiis ejus senatuique librum contra Gentiles tradidit, defendens ignominiam crucis, et resurrectionem Christi totâ prædicans libertate. Quid loquar de Melitone Sardensi episcopo? Quid de Apollinario Hieropolitanæ ecclesiæ sacerdote, Dionysioque Corinthiorum episcopo, et Tatiano, et Bardesane, et Irenæo, Pothini Martyris successore, qui origines hæreseôn singularum, et ex quibus philosophorum fontibus emanârint, multis voluminibus explicârunt? Pantænus Stoicæ sectæ philosophus, ob præcipuæ eruditionis gloriam, a Demetrio Alexandriæ episcopo missus est in Indiam, ut Christum apud Brachmanas et istius gentis philosophos prædicaret. Clemens, Alexandrinæ ecclesiæ presbyter, meo judicio omnium eruditissimus, octo scripsit Stromatum libros.—Quid in illis indoctum, imo quid non de mediâ philosophiâ est? Hunc imitatus Origines decem scripsit Stromateas, christianorum et philoso-

'ning of his epistle observed the learning of Moses, Solo-
'mon, and Paul, in the next place mentions two apologists
'for the christian religion in the time of Adrian, Quadratus,
'and Aristides. The next to them is Justin, also a philo-
'sopher, who presented an apology to Antoninus the Pious,
'and his sons, and the whole senate, against the Gentiles,
'warding off the ignominy of the cross, and with full free-
'dom and undaunted courage asserting the resurrection of
'Christ. Why should I speak of Melito bishop of Sardis,
'and Apollinarius bishop of Hierapolis, and Dionysius
'bishop of Corinth, and Tatian, and Bardesanes, and Ire-
'næus successor of Pothinus the martyr; who, in many
'volumes, have detected the origin of every heresy, and
'showed from what philosophers they were derived? Next,
'Pantænus a philosopher of the Stoic sect, and a man of
'great reputation for learning. Clement, presbyter of the
'church of Alexandria, in my opinion the most learned of
'all men, wrote eight books of Stromata, or Miscellanies,
'and other works, in which there is nothing unlearned, no-
'thing which is not fetched from the depths of philosophy;
'who was also followed and imitated by his disciple

phorum inter se sententias comparans et omnia nostræ religionis dogmata de Platone, et Aristotele, Numenio, Cornutoque confirmans. Scripsit et Miltiades contra Gentes volumen egregium. Hippolytus quoque et Apollonius, Romanæ urbis senatores, propria opuscula condiderunt. Extant et Julii Africani libri, qui temporum scripsit historias, et Theodori, qui postea Gregorius appellatus est, viri apostolicorum signorum atque virtutum, et Dionysii Alexandrini episcopi; Anatolii quoque Laodicenæ ecclesiæ sacerdotis, necnon presbyterorum Pamphili, Pierii, Luciani, Malchionis, Eusebii Cæsariensis episcopi, et Eustathii Antiocheni, et Athanasii Alexandrini; Eusebii quoque Emesseni, et Triphyllii Cyprii, et Asterii Scythopolitæ, et Serapionis confessoris; Titi quoque Bostrensis episcopi, Cappadocumque Basilii, Gregorii, Amphilochii. Qui omnes in tantum philosophorum doctrinis atque sententiis suos refarciunt libros, ut nescias quid in illis primum admirari debeas, eruditionem seculi, an scientiam scripturarum.

Veniam ad Latinos. Quid Tertulliano eruditius, quid acutius? Apologeticus ejus, et contra Gentes liber, cunctam seculi obtinent disciplinam. Minucius Felix, causidicus Romani fori, in libro, cui titulus Octavius est,—quid gentilium literarum reliquit intactum? Septem libros adversus Gentes Arnobius edidit, totidemque discipulus ejus Lactantius, qui de Irâ quoque et Opificio Dei duo volumina condidit. Quos si legere volueris, Dialogorum Ciceronis in eis επιτομην reperies. Victorino Martyri in libris suis, licet desit eruditio, tamen non deest eruditionis voluntas. Cyprianus, quod idola dii non sunt, quâ brevitate, quâ historiarum omnium scientiâ, quorum verborum et sensuum splendore perstrinxit? Hilarius, meorum confessor temporum et episcopus, duodecim Quintiliani libros et stylo imitatus est et numero. Juvencus presbyter sub Constantino historiam Domini Salvatoris versibus explicavit; nec pertimuit evangelii majestatem sub metri leges mittere. De cæteris vel mortuis vel viventibus taceo, quorum in scriptis suis et vires manifestæ sint et voluntas. Ad Mag. Orat. ep. 83. [al. 84.] T. 4.

'Origen.——Miltiades likewise wrote an excellent book 'against the Gentiles. Hippolytus and Apollonius, senators 'of Rome, published some works suitable to their cha- 'racter. There are also the works of Julius Africanus the 'chronologer, and of Theodore, afterwards called Gregory, 'a man of apostolical gifts and virtues, and of Dionysius 'bishop of Alexandria; as also of Anatolius bishop of the 'church of Laodicea; likewise of the presbyters Pamphi- 'lus, Pierius, Lucian, Malchion; Eusebius bishop of 'Cæsarea, Eustathius bishop of Antioch, Athanasius bishop 'of Alexandria, Eusebius of Emesa, Triphyllius of Cyprus, 'Asterius, and Serapion, Titus bishop of Bostra, and the 'Cappadocian bishops, Basil, Gregory, Amphilochius; who 'all have so filled their books with sentiments of the 'philosophers, and quotations from them, that it is not easy 'to say, which is more conspicuous and admirable in them, 'whether skill in profane learning, or the knowledge of 'the scriptures.

'I come now to the Latins. Who more learned, who 'more acute than Tertullian? His Apology and book 'against the Gentiles are filled with all manner of learning. 'Minucius Felix a Roman advocate, author of the book en- 'titled Octavius, has left untouched no part of human 'literature. Arnobius wrote seven books against the Gen- 'tiles, and his disciple Lactantius as many, beside two 'other volumes Of the Wrath of God, and the Creation of 'the World; which whoever reads, will see in them an 'epitome of the Dialogues of Cicero. If Victorinus was 'not learned, he did not want a good will to learning, as 'appears from his works. Cyprian demonstrated the va- 'nity of idols in a concise manner, showing great knowledge 'of history, and good sense; after whom follow Hilary and 'Juvencus: and he omits others,' he says, 'both living and 'dead, whose performances manifest the like abilities.'

So writes Jerom about the year 400, in defence of himself, and[c] in answer to a question put to him by Magnus, at the instigation of Rufinus, Why he often quoted heathen authors in his works?

Jerom, in vindication of himself, was led to such writers of the church as were remarkable for learning, and had made use of their learning in their writings: he therefore here begins with Quadratus and Aristides. We have written the history of some more early christian writers, which

[c] Quod autem quæris in calce epistolæ tuæ, cur in opusculis nostris secularium literarum interdum ponamus exempla, et candorem ecclesiæ ethnicorum sordibus polluamus. Ead. Ep. sub in.

also are in Jerom's catalogue; and we have likewise proceeded lower, and have taken in Jerom himself, his contemporary Rufinus, and Augustine, Chrysostom, Theodoret, and many others, all joining in the same testimony, and some way or other doing honour to christianity. Moreover we have taken a good number of others in several ages, who, in some respects, differed from the catholics: some of which deserve to be here mentioned, a large account having been given of them; such as Noetus, Paul of Samosata, Sabellius, Marcellus, Photinus, the Novatians, Donatists, Manichees, Priscillianists, beside Artemon, the Audians, the Aërians, and divers others, of whom a brief notice has been taken; all receiving most, or all the same books of the New Testament, which the catholics received, and agreeing in a like respect for them, as written by apostles, or their disciples and companions.

2. The next thing fit to be observed here, in the review of our work, is, that all along great care has been taken to distinguish genuine and supposititious writings, and to assign the true time of the authors and writings that have been alleged.

Thus, for instance, we have separated the epistle written by Clement to the Corinthians, in the name of the church of Rome, from a fragment sometimes ascribed to him. If that fragment is not Clement's, nor written before the third century, (which seems very probable,) the alleging it as his might have been of bad consequence, and have led us into divers mistakes.

And how many mistakes might have been made upon receiving the Apostolical Constitutions, as they are called, as a work of the same bishop of Rome, who died before the end of the first century? Certainly they are better spoken of near the end of the fourth century, as we have done.

We have also supposed the smaller, and not the larger or interpolated epistles of Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, to be genuine. The admitting these to be genuine, and alleging them as such, would have made a great alteration in the testimony of the most early ages, and the apostolical fathers themselves, which must have had a very bad effect.

It is no small pleasure to me to find that, beside others[d] formerly mentioned, Mr. Jortin also, who has been lately examining the writings of the first ages, approves the smaller epistles and rejects the larger. A part of what he says may be very pertinently alleged here for confirming the observation just made: 'Thus[e] the shorter epistles of

[d] See vol. ii. p. 76.

[e] Remarks on Ecclesiastical History, vol. i. [1751.] p. 61—63. See also p. 361.

'Ignatius allude to the writings of the apostles; but in the 'larger epistles, which are generally supposed to be inter- 'polated, the passages of the Old and New Testament are 'more numerous, and are cited more accurately and dis- 'tinctly, and sometimes impertinently, as in the Constitu- 'tions, and are introduced with, "Thus saith the Lord, thus 'says Paul, and Peter, and Luke, and thus say the scrip- 'tures." The apostolical fathers rather allude than cite; 'and therefore the hand of the forger discovers itself in 'these epistles.'

'Ignatius wrote his letters, when he was condemned, and 'chained, and guarded, and conducted by soldiers, who 'were brutes, and used him ill.—Therefore it is more pro- 'bable that the shorter epistles should be genuine than the 'larger, with their pomp and parade of passages from the 'Old and New Testament, which secessum scribentis et otia 'quærunt.'

The same learned and ingenious writer rejects also the Apostolical Constitutions, which he considers as[f] an imposture.

There is another work, which may be not improperly mentioned here, though we omit many others. I mean particularly a tract of St. Cyprian, entitled, 'Testimonies against 'the Jews, to Quirinus,' in three books, in which many texts of the Old and New Testament are cited: I do not dispute the genuineness of that work; but I suppose it to be interpolated, and therefore have argued that[g] it ought to be quoted with caution.

Another thing, by which learned men, as I apprehend, suffer themselves to be sometimes misled, is ascribing too early a date to the Latin translation of the work of Irenæus concerning heresies. This also was taken notice of in some observations upon that tract of St. Cyprian; where we mentioned Mr. Dodwell's opinion, that[h] it was not published till after the year 385; whilst some others have imagined that translation to have been made during the lifetime of Irenæus himself.

And I here cheerfully acknowledge the assistances received from Cave, Fabricius, Tillemont, Pagi, Basnage, and other learned critics among the moderns; whereby I have been enabled to produce authors in their true time, and to distinguish genuine and supposititious writings, which cannot but contribute to the value of their testimony, and I hope has rendered it irrefragable.

[f] Remarks as before, vol. i. p. 228—259.

[g] Vol. iii. p. 16—19. [h] Vol. iii. p. 23. See also p. 25. note [e].

3. I mention another thing, as some compensation of the long labours of this inquiry, that we have observed several authors, so early as the third century, who received the epistle to the Hebrews, who have been generally overlooked by learned men, and even by those who[i] have written dissertations upon that epistle. I intend[k] Theognostus an Alexandrian, who flourished about the year 280, and[l] Methodius, who flourished about 290, and[m] the author of a poem against the Marcionites, whose age is uncertain, and probably[n] Pamphilus. I suppose likewise, that there may be seen in this book more quotations of ancient authors, who speak of St. Peter's epistles as written to Gentiles, than in any work hitherto written upon the canon of the New Testament.

4. All along, where there has been occasion, we have carefully observed what notice has been taken of spurious and apocryphal books, (which might seem on account of their titles, or otherwise, to make a claim to be a part of the canon,) especially by the more ancient christian writers. And, if I mistake not, it has appeared, after a fair and careful examination, that though there were doubts about some of the books now generally received as canonical, yet there were no other beside them which those ancient writers received as part of the rule of faith, and that they alleged them by way of illustration only.

This was the great design of the late Mr. Jeremiah Jones, in the two first volumes of his 'New and full Method of 'settling the canonical Authority of the New Testament, in 'which the several apocryphal books are collected, with an 'English translation of each of them; together with a par-'ticular proof, that none of them were ever admitted into 'the canon.' And, I presume, it will be allowed by all readers of this work, that the design of that diligent writer has been carried on by us, and that his argument has been confirmed.

5. Though our design has primarily led us to observe the testimony of christian writers to the books of the New Testament, we have not entirely overlooked their testimony to the Old Testament, and divers catalogues of the ancient scriptures may be seen in this book, with remarks upon them.

6. Beside showing in every age the books of scripture

[i] None of the authors there mentioned are in Fr. Spanhem. Dissert. de Auctore Epistolæ ad Hebræos. Opp. T. ii. p. 171, &c. or in Mr. Hallet's Introduction to the Epistle to the Hebrews. [k] See vol. iii. p. 152.
[l] Ibid. p. 195, 196. [m] P. 171. [n] P. 226.

received by each writer, many passages have been alleged, testifying their great regard for the scriptures, assuring us, that they were publicly, and respectfully read in the assemblies of christians in the language generally understood by the people, and earnestly recommending the reading and studying them in private as the duty of all sorts of people, and what would be highly advantageous to them. I believe there may be in this book more passages of this kind, taken from early christian writers, than in the collection of A. B. Usher, 'de Scripturis, et Sacris Vernaculis,' and the 'Auctarium' of Henry Wharton, written purposely upon this one point.

7. In this book may be seen many observations, showing the credibility of the evangelical history, especially taken from Augustine, Chrysostom, and Theodoret; though some also from Eusebius of Cæsarea, and other writers: divers of which passages must be very acceptable to most readers, and perhaps will appear to some equal to the best arguments of the most learned modern defenders of the christian religion.

8. In this book are some passages, bearing express testimony not only to the scriptures, but also to divers of the principal facts of the New Testament; particularly to the miracles of our Lord's ministry, his death, resurrection, and ascension, and the extraordinary works performed by his apostles.

9. There are many passages, representing and expatiating upon the swift and wonderful progress of the gospel over the world, collected for the most part out of Jerom, Augustine, Chrysostom, Theodoret, and later writers.

Indeed these are very proper for the next book: but every thing of this kind could not be well passed over. Besides, our collections relating to this, and the last preceding article, are chiefly taken out of the writers of the fourth, fifth, and following centuries, reserving those of the more early ages for another time and the next book.

10. There are likewise in some chapters, select passages upon a variety of subjects, which cannot but afford entertainment to inquisitive readers of good taste, especially if they have any desire to judge rightly of the character of christian writers in past ages, and those the best and purest ages, on which we have principally enlarged.

A RECAPITULATION

OF THE

SECOND PART

OF THE

CREDIBILITY OF THE GOSPEL HISTORY.

CHAP. I.

IN the epistle of St. Barnabas there is not any express mention made of any book of the New Testament: but there are in it some expressions which are in St. Matthew's gospel, and are introduced with this mark of quotation: "it is written." There are in it likewise the exact words of several other texts of the New Testament: and there may be thought to be allusions to some others. Nevertheless, I think it cannot be said with certainty, that he referred to any books of the New Testament: nor ought it to be reckoned strange, that a man, who was contemporary with the apostles, and had the same spirit and like gifts with them, if he was not an apostle himself, should often reason and argue like them, without quoting their writings, or referring to them.

Ch. II. Clement[a] bishop of Rome wrote an epistle in the

[a] Says Mr. Jortin, in the first volume of his remarks on Ecclesiastical History, p. 336, 337. 'Clemens epist. 1. 4. says 'Δια ζηλον ὁ πατηρ ἡμων 'Ιακωβ απεδρα,—" propter æmulationem pater noster Jacobus aufugit." 'Whence, I find, some persons have lately discovered and concluded, that 'Clemens was a Jew. I think the passage will not prove it. Theophilus ad 'Autol. iii. 23.—τα γραμματα τε θειε νομε, τε δια Μωσεως ἡμιν δεδομενε. 'The law was given to us, says Theophilus; and yet he had been converted

name of the church over which he presided, to the church of Corinth. In his epistle, the first epistle to the Corinthians is quoted in this manner: 'Take into your hands the 'epistle of the blessed Paul the apostle. What did he at 'first write unto you in the beginning of the gospel? Verily 'he did by the Spirit admonish you concerning himself, 'and Cephas, and Apollos, because that even then you did 'form parties.' Compare 1 Cor. i. 12. He has likewise passages out of the epistle to the Romans, and some other of the apostolical epistles. And passages of the gospels of St. Matthew, and St. Luke, though without naming the evangelists, are introduced in this respectful manner: 'And 'let us do, as it is written.—For thus saith the Holy Spi-'rit,—Especially remembering the words of the Lord Jesus 'which he spake.'—Again: "Remember the words of the Lord Jesus."—Or, as it is expressed, p. 46, 'The first 'epistle to the Corinthians is expressly ascribed by Clement 'to Paul. Words of our blessed Lord, found in the gospels 'of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, are recommended with a 'high degree of respect, but without the names of the 'evangelists.' And, I think, there are in him allusions to the Acts of the Apostles, the epistle to the Romans, the first and second to the Corinthians, and to divers other of the epistles of the New Testament.

Ch. III. In the Fragment, by some supposed to be Clement's, but more probably written about the middle of the third century, no evangelist is expressly named, or epistle of the New Testament expressly cited. But the gospels are several times quoted, with such terms as these: 'He 'himself says: The Lord says: Thus saith the Lord: An-

'from paganism to christianity. Therefore when any ancient christian writers 'use such expressions, it is not to be inferred thence, with any kind of cer-'tainty, that they were of Jewish extraction, or even that they had been pro-'selytes to judaism. Indeed nothing is more natural, than for christians to 'speak as if they were Abraham's children; as if the law and the prophets, 'and the patriarchs, belonged to them as well as to the Jews. In the same 'book, sect. 24. Theophilus says: *Αβρααμ ὁ πατριαρχης ἡμων.* 94. *Δαυιδ ὁ 'προγονος ἡμων.* 27. *Αβρααμ τȣ προπατορος ἡμων.*' I suppose Mr. Jortin may intend Mr. Bower, in his History of the Popes, Vol. i. p. 15. A learned foreigner likewise has very lately argued, that Clement of Rome was a man of Jewish extraction—cum Clemens fuerit origine Judæus, ut probabile est ex eo, quod 'Jacobum patrem nostrum' appellans, se iis adjungere videatur, quorum pater fuit Jacob secundum carnem. H. Venem. Ep. secund. de genuitate epistolar. Clement. a Cl. Wetsten. publicat. p. 76. I think, that Mr. Jortin has well confuted that argument: nevertheless I shall here refer to some passages, formerly quoted from Lactantius, a convert from Gentilism, where he speaks of the Jewish people, as the ancestors of christians. See vol. iii. ch. lxv. num. iv. 1.

'other scripture says:' and 'The Lord saith in the gospel.' And there seem to be references to some of the epistles of the New Testament.

Ch. IV. Hermas has no express quotations of the books of the New Testament: nor was it suitable to the design of his work to make such quotations: or, as it is expressed, p. 65, 'Here are certainly many allusions to our genuine 'books of the New Testament, though they are not cited. 'The reason is, that it was not suitable to the nature of the 'work to quote books.' There seem to be in him allusions to several parts of the New Testament, particularly the gospels of Matthew, Luke, and John; the Acts; the epistle to the Romans; the first to the Corinthians; the epistle to the Ephesians; the epistle of James; and the book of the Revelation.

Ch. V. Ignatius was bishop of Antioch in Syria, in the latter part of the first, and the beginning of the second century. He was sent prisoner from Antioch to Rome, where he suffered martyrdom in the year 107, or soon after. In his journey to Rome he wrote several letters, which are generally received as his; some of them were written whilst he was at Smyrna, the others at Troas. He expressly ascribes the epistle to the Ephesians to St. Paul. For, writing to them, he says: 'Ye are the "symmystæ of 'Paul," or, ye are the companions of Paul in the mysteries 'of the gospel, who throughout all his epistle makes men-'tion of you in Christ Jesus.' And in the same letter he has several passages out of St. Paul's epistle to the Ephesians: and besides, there are in him plain allusions or references to the gospels of St. Matthew and St. John, and a probable allusion to St. Luke's. There seem likewise to be allusions to the Acts of the Apostles; the epistle to the Romans; the first and second to the Corinthians; the Galatians; Philippians; first to the Thessalonians; the second to Timothy; the first epistle of St. Peter; the first and third epistles of St. John.

Moreover, he has expressions, denoting a collection of gospels, and apostolical epistles. So say Grabe, Mill, and Le Clerc: and I think it proper now to transcribe[b] Mill, to whom I formerly referred only.

[b] Verum et aliquanto ante Marcionem, et quidem ante annum Christi xciv. exstabat Codex Apostolicus. Quod enim a nemine, quod quidem sciam, huc usque observatum fuit, monuit nos olim clarissimus Grabius, Ignatium utriusque hujus canonis mentionem fecisse, in epistolâ ad Philadelphicos. Προσφυγων τῳ ευαγγελιῳ, κ. λ. nempe per ευαγγελιον Codicem Evangelicum, per αποστολους Codicem Epistolicum, per prophetas Canonem V. T. συνεκδοχικως intelligendum existimat. Id quod nobis postea persuasissimum erat,

In the epistle to the Philadelphians are these expressions: 'Fleeing to the gospel as the flesh of Jesus, and to the 'apostles as the presbytery of the church. Let us also love 'the prophets.'

Here by 'gospel' is meant the book, or code, or volume of the gospels: by 'the apostles' the volume or collection of their epistles: as by 'the prophets' are meant the volume or canon of the Old Testament.

Again: to the church at Smyrna: 'Whom neither the 'prophecies, nor the law of Moses have persuaded; nor 'yet the gospel even to this day.'

Here the 'gospel' seems to be used for the volume of the New Testament in general, consisting of gospels and epistles.

These passages, especially that from the epistle to the Philadelphians, seem to show, that in the time of Ignatius, and probably some while before, there were two codes or collections, one of the four gospels, another of epistles: but how full this last code was, we cannot now determine with certainty.

It should be observed, that in one place of these epistles of Ignatius there has been supposed to be a reference to the gospel according to the Hebrews: nevertheless, we rather think, that the passage contains only a loose quotation of some words of St. Luke's gospel; as has been at large argued near the end of the chapter of Ignatius.

Ch. VI. The next writer is Polycarp, a disciple of St. John, and appointed bishop of the church of Smyrna by him, if not also by some other apostles joining with him: and it may be supposed, that he had conversed with several, who had seen the Lord. He had the honour to die a martyr for Christ at Smyrna, in the year 148, as some think, or in 166 or 169, as others think. But his epistle to the Philippians, the only thing remaining and certainly known to be his, seems to have been written in 108. In which he quotes to these Philippians themselves the epistle written by Paul to them, and, as I apprehend, the two epistles to the Thessalonians, in the same country of Macedonia, saying: 'For neither I, nor any one like me, can come up to

etiam ex aliis Ignatii locis. Nonnunquam enim Evangelii vocem strictius sumere videtur pro Codice Evangelico. Vid. Epist. ad Smyrn. sect. 7. et Ep. ad Philad. sect. 9. Tum vero alias laxiori significatu Evangelium apud eum pro canone integro N. T. acceptum videmus: ubi simul memorat legem Mosis, prophetias, et evangelium. Vid. Ep. ad Smyrn. sect. 5. Quod si vero res ita se habet, Canon Epistolicus mediocri temporis intervallo præcesserit, necesse est, epistolas Ignatianas. ideoque et prodierit sub annum forte æræ vulgaris ex. sive etiam aliquanto ante. Mill. Proleg. n. 198, 199.

'the wisdom of the blessed and renowned Paul, who, when 'absent, wrote to you letters: into which, if you look, you 'will be able to edify yourselves in the faith, which has 'been delivered unto you.' In another following chapter he speaks again as plainly as here of the apostle Paul's having written to them. No book of the New Testament is quoted by Polycarp expressly, and by name: however here are quotations of passages of the first epistle to the Corinthians, the epistle to the Ephesians, the epistle to the Philippians, and the two epistles to the Thessalonians. Words of our Lord found in St. Matthew's and St. Luke's gospels, are quoted as spoken by him: and beside these, there are references, which may be reckoned undoubted, to the Acts of the Apostles, the epistle to the Romans, the first and second to the Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, first and second to Timothy, the first of St. Peter, the first of St. John, and a probable reference to the epistle to the Hebrews. And the many exhortations, delivered in the words of Christ, and his apostles, in a short letter, are a convincing evidence of the respect which christians then had for these books, and that they were deeply engraved in their memories.

Ch. VII. The next chapter has the relation of Polycarp's martyrdom, and general observations upon the testimony of the apostolical fathers. Some of them I here recite again, and make some additions.

Obs. 1. Barnabas has many more passages out of the Old Testament than the New; which may be reckoned owing to the time and character of the writer. Moreover he argues chiefly with Jews.

Obs. 2. Clement has more passages out of the Old Testament, and oftener alludes to it, than to the New: but yet he quotes this more than once, and often refers to it.

Obs. 3. Hermas quotes neither the Old nor the New Testament. The reason is, because he only relates his visions, and delivers precepts as received from angels.

Obs. 4. Ignatius has alluded much oftener to the New Testament than to the Old.

Obs. 5. Polycarp has alluded above twenty times to texts of the New Testament, or recited the very words of them, and scarce once refers to any passage of the Old Testament.

Obs. 6. In the writings of these apostolical fathers there is all the notice taken of the books of the New Testament, that could be expected. Barnabas, though so early a writer, appears to have been acquainted with the gospel of St.

Matthew. Clement, writing to the church of Corinth, on occasion of a dissension there, desires them to 'take into 'their hands the epistle of the blessed apostle Paul written 'to them :' and particularly refers them to a part of that epistle, in which he had admonished them against strife and contention. He has likewise, in his epistle, divers clear and undeniable allusions to St. Paul's epistle, sent to the church over which he presided, and in whose name he wrote; not to repeat here other things lately taken notice of.

Quotations there could not be in Hermas, as has been observed again and again. But allusions there are to the books of the New Testament, such as were suitable to his design.

Ignatius, writing to the church of the Ephesians, takes notice of the epistles of Paul sent to them, 'in which he 'makes mention of them in Christ Jesus.'

Polycarp, writing to the Philippians, refers them to the epistle of the apostle Paul written to them: if not also, as I imagine he does, to the epistle sent to the Thessalonian christians in the same province. Not now to insist on his quotations of texts or passages of other books of the New Testament, or his numerous and manifest allusions to them.

Obs. 7. From all which it is apparent, that these early writers have not omitted to take notice of any book of the New Testament, which their design led them to mention: their silence therefore about any other books can be no prejudice to the supposition of their genuineness, if we shall hereafter meet with credible testimonies to them. And we have good reason to believe, that these apostolical fathers were some of the persons from whom succeeding writers received that full and satisfactory evidence, which they appear to have had concerning the several books of the New Testament.

Obs. 8. Ignatius has expressions, denoting two codes or collections, one of gospels, the other of epistles of apostles.

Obs. 9. There are not in any of these apostolical fathers any quotations of apocryphal books concerning the history, or the doctrine, of Christ and his apostles. There is indeed one passage of Ignatius, in which some have supposed to be a reference to the gospel according to the Hebrews: but we rather think it a quotation of the gospel of St. Luke. There is also at the end of the Fragment ascribed to Clement, a quotation, supposed[c] to be taken from the gospel according to the Egyptians: but we have no reason to be

[c] Vid. Grabe, Spic. T. i. p. 35.

much concerned about it; that not being a work of Clement, but, probably, of some writer of the third century.

Ch. VIII. In the history of things in the time of Trajan, whose reign began in 98, and ended in 117, Eusebius says: 'There were many eminent men, who had the first rank in 'the succession of the apostles; divers of whom travelling 'abroad performed the office of evangelists, being am- 'bitious to preach Christ, and to deliver the scripture of 'the divine gospels.' This affords an argument, that at that time and before, the gospels were well known and collected together. They who went forth to preach the salutary doctrine of the kingdom of heaven to those who were yet unacquainted with it, carried the gospels with them, and delivered them to their converts. The gospels therefore must have been collected together, and must have been for some while in use, and in the highest esteem among the disciples of the apostles, and in the churches planted by them. And I presume, that few or none will hesitate to allow, that Eusebius must be understood to speak here of the four gospels, so well known in his time.

Ch. IX. Papias was well acquainted with Polycarp, and John the elder, as is allowed, and by some is supposed to have been acquainted with John the apostle and evangelist. If it had been certain, that he was conversant with the last-mentioned John, he ought to be reckoned an apostolical man, and should have been placed with those of that character already spoken of. As that is not certain, we place him in the next rank after those who were disciples of apostles. He expressly bears testimony to the gospels of Matthew and Mark; and he quoted the first epistle of St. Peter, and the first epistle of St. John. He seems also to have a reference to the book of the Acts. There is reason to suppose he received the book of the Revelation.

Ch. X. Justin Martyr, a native of Palestine, a learned man, and a traveller, converted to christianity about the year 133, flourished chiefly from the year 140 and afterwards, and died a martyr, as is supposed, in 164 or 167. His remaining works are two Apologies, addressed, or inscribed, one to Titus Antoninus the Pious, the other to Marcus Antoninus the Philosopher, and the senate and people of Rome, (but this last is not now entire,) and a Dialogue with Trypho a Jew. In which works are many quotations of the four gospels, though he does not name the evangelists. There are also references to the book of the Acts, and to divers of the epistles of the New Testament. The Revelation is expressly quoted, as written by John, an

apostle of Christ. The gospels he calls 'memoirs' or commentaries: 'Memoirs of the apostles: Christ's memoirs: 'memoirs of the apostles and their companions, who have 'written the history of all things concerning our Saviour 'Jesus Christ:' plainly meaning Matthew and John, Mark and Luke. In his first Apology he says, the 'memoirs of 'the apostles, and the writings of the prophets,' were read in the assemblies of public worship, and a discourse was made upon them by the president: whence it appears, that the gospels were well known in the world, and not designedly concealed from any. Whether Justin has referred to any apocryphal scriptures, is considered at the end of the chapter.

Ch. XI. In the elegant epistle to Diognetus, sometimes called Justin's, but probably not his, there are no books or writers of the New Testament expressly named: but there are texts out of the gospels of Matthew and John, or allusions and references to them, and also to the epistle to the Romans, the first and second to the Corinthians, the epistle to the Philippians, the first and second to Timothy, the first epistle of Peter, and the first of John: all which allusions are so plain, that they must be reckoned undisputed. A text of the first epistle to the Corinthians is thus cited or introduced: 'the apostle says,' meaning Paul. He also appears to have had a volume of gospels and apostolical epistles, which he joins with the law and the prophets, in this manner: 'The fear of the law is sung' or celebrated, 'the grace of the prophets is known, the faith of the gos-'pels is established, and the tradition of the apostles is 'kept.'

Ch. XII. Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, as we learn from Eusebius, wrote seven letters to divers churches, and one to a christian woman; of which nothing remains, except some fragments; in which, however, we can trace references to the Acts, and some of the epistles. He speaks of the 'scriptures of the Lord,' which some had endeavoured to corrupt, probably meaning Marcion, whose heresy he designedly opposed in one of his letters.

Ch. XIII. Tatian, a man well skilled in human literature, composed a Harmony of the Gospels, called Diatessaron, or, Of the Four. Theodoret, of the fifth century, found two hundred copies of this work among the catholics, beside those in use among the people of his own sect. Tatian is also said to have corrected the composition of St. Paul's style; which, perhaps, may have been nothing more than some marginal notes and emendations. Jerom speaks likewise of Tatian's rejecting some of St. Paul's epistles, whilst

he received that to Titus. Here is a remarkable attestation to the number of the gospels, as four only. Tatian was a Syrian; possibly his Harmony was more common in that country than any other. This may be the reason why Theodoret found so many copies of it, and why Ephrem the Syrian, as is said, wrote a commentary upon it. A more particular account of this work of Tatian may be seen in the 36th chapter; where is likewise a large account of another Harmony of the four gospels, composed by Ammonius of Alexandria.

Ch. XIV. The sum of the testimony of Hegesippus, a Jew converted to the christian faith, is this: that he has divers things expressed in the style of the gospels, and the Acts, and some other parts of the New Testament. He refers to the history, in the second chapter of St. Matthew, and recites another text of that gospel, as spoken by the Lord. Hegesippus travelled: he was at Corinth, and from thence went to Rome; and he says, that 'in every city,' among christians, 'the same doctrine was taught, which the law, 'and the prophets, and the Lord, preacheth;' where, by 'the Lord,' he must mean the scriptures of the New Testament, which he looks upon as containing the very doctrine taught and preached by Jesus Christ. Moreover, he had a Hebrew gospel, supposed to be the gospel according to the Hebrews; and he says, there had been books forged by heretics, but they were such only as were called apocryphal, and were not received by catholics as of authority.

Ch. XV. Melito, bishop of Sardis, in Lydia, says in Eusebius, 'that when he went into the East, he procured 'an accurate account of the books of the Old Testament;' whence it may be argued, that there was then a volume, or collection of books, called the New Testament, containing the writings of apostles and apostolical men. One of his works, now lost, was entitled, Of the Revelation of John; so that he received that book, and probably many others, collected together in a volume, called the New Testament, as the books received by the Jews as of divine authority, were called the Old Testament.

Ch. XVI. The churches of Vienne and Lyons, in Gaul, wrote an epistle to the churches of Asia and Phrygia, containing a relation of the sufferings of their martyrs in the time of Marcus Antoninus. They express themselves in the language of St. Luke and St. John, and the Acts of the Apostles, the epistles to the Romans, the Philippians, and some other epistles of St. Paul, the first of St. Peter, the

first of St. John, and the Revelation; but no book of the New Testament is expressly named: however, a text of St. John's gospel is quoted, as 'spoken by the Lord.'

Ch. XVII. Irenæus, probably a native of Asia, in his younger days acquainted with Polycarp, who was a disciple of St. John, for a while presbyter of the church of Lyons, in Gaul, and successor to Pothinus, as bishop, who, at the age of ninety, died in prison, in 177, in the time of the above-mentioned persecution of Marcus Antoninus; beside other things, composed a work against heresies, in five books, in which is a most noble testimony to the scriptures of the New Testament: for he assures us, there were four gospels received by the church, and no more, all which he has often and largely quoted, with the names of the writers; as also the book of the Acts, which he ascribes to Luke; and twelve epistles of St. Paul, most of them with the names of the churches, or persons, to whom they were sent. The epistle to Philemon is not quoted; which may be owing to its brevity, and that he had no particular occasion to make use of it. There is no plain proof that he received the epistle to the Hebrews. He has likewise quoted the first epistle of St. Peter, and the first and second of St. John, and the book of the Revelation, as St. John's, and written in the time of the emperor Domitian; but there are not any clear references to the epistles of St. James, the second of St. Peter, or the epistle of St. Jude. The reason of his not quoting the third epistle of St. John may be allowed to be its brevity. There are in him, likewise, many expressions, testifying his great regard for these scriptures; and it has been shown, that Irenæus quotes not Hermas, nor Clement, nor any other writer, as of authority, or with a like regard, which he manifests for the books above mentioned. At the end of the chapter it is considered upon what ground Irenæus received the writings of St. Mark and St. Luke, who were not apostles.

Ch. XVIII. Athenagoras, whose station in the church is not known, a learned man, and a polite writer, author of an Apology for the christians, addressed, as it seems, to Marcus Antoninus and Commodus, and of a Treatise of the Resurrection, plainly appears to have made use of St. Matthew, and St. John, and several of St. Paul's epistles.

Ch. XIX. Miltiades was author of an Apology for the christians, near the end of the reign of Marcus Antoninus, or at the beginning of the reign of Commodus, and of a Treatise against the Montanists, and also of two Treatises

against the Jews and the Gentiles, now lost; which works, as Eusebius assures us, 'were monuments of his zeal for 'the divine oracles.'

Ch. XX. Theophilus, a learned man, of a heathen became a christian, and was afterwards bishop of Antioch; of which church he is sometimes reckoned the sixth, at other times the seventh, bishop. He wrote three books to Autolycus, a learned and studious heathen, still extant; beside which, Eusebius mentions a book against Marcion, another against the heresy of Hermogenes, neither of which has come down to us. We are assured by Eusebius, that in this last-mentioned work Theophilus quoted St. John's Revelation. In the three books of Autolycus, which remain, the beginning of St. John's gospel is expressly quoted, as John's, and a part of sacred scripture. He has likewise quoted texts of St. Matthew's gospel as plainly as if he had named him; he seems also to allude to some things in St. Luke's gospel; and besides, there are sufficiently plain references to the epistles of St. Paul to the Romans, first and second to the Corinthians, the Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, first to Timothy, and to Titus; with divers marks of high respect for the scriptures of the prophets, and the gospels.—Jerom ascribes to the works of Theophilus a[d] good deal of elegance.

It ought to be observed by us, that Jerom,[e] in one of his epistles, has quoted, as a work of Theophilus, a kind of Harmony of the four evangelists, or a compendious history of the four gospels in a continued narration. I do not think it to be his, because it is omitted by Eusebius; nor is it mentioned by Jerom in his article of Theophilus, in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers; or, if it is, he rejects it[f] as not worthy of Theophilus, and not equal in elegance to his other writings. But then, if it is not Theophilus's, it is the work of some other anonymous ancient, who lived before Jerom's time; consequently it deserves to be regarded, as bearing testimony to the four gospels, and the Acts of the Apostles; the history of which, likewise, is there quoted or plainly referred to.

Ch. XXI. Pantænus, a man in great reputation for learning, was president of the catechetical school at Alexandria:

[d] —— et contra hæresim Hermogenis liber unus, et alii breves elegantesque tractatus, ad ædificationem ecclesiæ pertinentes. Legi sub nomine ejus in evangelium, et in proverbia Salomonis commentarios, qui mihi cum superiorum voluminum elegantiâ et phrasi non videntur congruere. De V. I. cap. 25.

[e] See the chapter of Theophilus, vol. ii. p. 203.

[f] See before, note [d].

'for,' as Eusebius says, in his account of this person, 'there 'had been from ancient time erected among them a school 'of sacred learning, which remains to this day: and we 'have understood, that it has been wont to be furnished 'with men eminent for their eloquence, and the study of 'divine things;' and what follows; for I choose rather to refer my readers to the chapter itself, than transcribe any more here.

Ch. XXII. Clement, a presbyter, was president of the catechetical school of Alexandria, and is supposed to have been immediate successor of Pantænus before mentioned; a very learned man, and as Eusebius's expression is, 'an 'excellent master of the christian philosophy.' He is one of those, who have borne a noble testimony to the scriptures of the New Testament, in their writings: the sum of which is: He assures us, that there were four gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John; and has taken notice of their order, and particularly of the place and occasion of writing St. Mark's gospel. He likewise often quotes the Acts of the Apostles, written by St. Luke. He receives and quotes, frequently and expressly, the fourteen epistles of St. Paul, excepting only that to Philemon, which he has no where mentioned, that we know of; which omission may be well supposed owing to no other reason, but the brevity of the epistle, and his having no occasion to quote it. He also quotes the first epistle of Peter, and the first of St. John, and seems to have known of another, if not two other epistles of that apostle, though they are not quoted. He also receives and quotes the epistle of St. Jude, and the book of the Revelation as St. John's. But we have not found in him any quotations of the epistle of St. James, or the second of St. Peter, nor any evidences that these were received by him.

He expresseth the profoundest respect for the scriptures; of which he speaks with these several divisions, showing that there were collections of the gospels, and apostolical epistles: 'There is a harmony,' he says, 'between the law 'and the prophets, the apostles and the gospel; one God 'is preached by the law, the prophets, and the gospel: we 'should do those things, which the apostle and the gospel 'command; there are two ways spoken of by the gospel, 'and the apostles, and by all the prophets.'

As Clement quotes many books, we have particularly considered, whether he quotes any, beside those already mentioned, as sacred and of authority: and we have carefully observed his quotations, both of such writers as are

called Ecclesiastical, Barnabas, Clement of Rome, and Hermas; and likewise of such writings as are called apocryphal, the gospels according to the Hebrews and according to the Egyptians, the Preaching of Peter, and some others; and we are of opinion, it has been shown that there is no good reason to think, that Clement received as scripture, in the highest sense of that word, any christian writings beside those now commonly received by us.

Ch. XXIII. Polycrates was bishop of Ephesus. In the little that remains of him are references to the gospels of St. Matthew, and St. John, and the Acts: and he speaks of the 'holy scriptures' as the rule of faith.

Ch. XXIV. Heraclitus, and several other writers, near the end of the second century.

Heraclitus, in the reign of Commodus and Severus, wrote a Commentary upon the apostle, meaning Paul, but we do not know upon how many of his epistles. Beside him, here are five other writers expressly named; Maximus, Candidus, Appion, Sextus, and Arabianus, who had published works against heretics, or in defence of some doctrine of the christian religion; whose right faith appeared by 'the interpretations of the divine scripture given in their works,' as Eusebius says.

Ch. XXV. Hermias, whose character is not known, has left a short and elegant discourse in the Greek language, entitled, A Derision of the Gentile Philosophers; in which he expressly quotes the blessed apostle Paul's [first] epistle to the Corinthians.

Ch. XXVI. Serapion, computed the eighth bishop of the church of Antioch, wrote divers treatises and letters, particularly a letter to the church of Rhossus in Cilicia, concerning 'the gospel according to Peter;' of which letter a valuable fragment remains, showing the falsities of that pretended gospel, and expressing great regard for Peter and the other apostles of Christ, and their genuine writings.

Ch. XXVII. Tertullian, a learned man, presbyter of Carthage in Africa, afterwards a Montanist, flourished in the latter part of the second, or in the beginning of the third century. He receives and quotes often the four gospels, the Acts of the Apostles written by Luke, the importance of which book he takes particular notice of. He received thirteen epistles of the apostle Paul: that to the Hebrews he ascribes to Barnabas. He likewise quotes the first epistle of St. Peter, the first of St. John, the epistle of St. Jude, and the book of the Revelation as written by John the apostle. But there appear not in him any quotations

of the epistle of St. James, the second of St. Peter, or the second and third of St. John. He asserts the integrity, and the authority or inspiration of the scriptures received by him, 'even the law and the prophets, with the evangelic 'and apostolic scriptures,' or, 'the words of the prophets, 'gospels, and apostles,' from which we are to learn the faith; and he takes little notice of any books, which are not in our present canon.

Ch. XXVIII. Several writers of the second century, whose works are lost.

Quadratus and Aristides, both supposed to be of the country of Greece, the latter particularly styled an Athenian philosopher, who, about the year 126, presented Apologies for the christian religion to the emperor Adrian; Soter, bishop of Rome, about the year 164; Pinytus, bishop of Gnossus, in Crete; Philip, bishop of Gortyna, in the same island; Palmas, bishop of Amastris, in Pontus, all about the year 170; Musanus, who, about 176, wrote against the Encratites; Modestus, who, about the same time, wrote an elaborate work against Marcion; Claudius Apollinaris, bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia, about the year 176, who wrote an Apology addressed to Marcus Antoninus, and five books against the Gentiles; Rhodon and others, who by their learning and labours edified the churches of Christ, and defended the christian religion against Jews and heathens, and asserted its purity against the innovations of error, then beginning to be introduced: here also is an account of Bardesanes the Syrian, and Symmachus an Ebionite, who made a new version of the Hebrew scriptures of the Old Testament into Greek.

Ch. XXIX. Here is an account of supposititious writings of the second century.

1. 'The Acts of Paul and Thecla;' in which are divers allusions and references to the gospel of St. Matthew, the Acts of the Apostles, and some of St. Paul's epistles.

2. 'The Sibylline Verses or Oracles, in eight books.' They may be justly reckoned a confirmation of our gospels, and satisfy us that they were the books used by christian people, as containing an authentic history of Jesus Christ, his birth, preaching, miracles, death, and resurrection. The author has borrowed little from the epistles of the New Testament; but he may be supposed indebted to the Revelation for several things; and there seems to be a reference to the book of the Acts.

3. 'The Testaments of the twelve patriarchs;' the author of which, in an indirect manner, and an assumed propheti-

cal style, bears a large testimony to the christian religion, to the facts, principles, and books of the New Testament; particularly (though by allusion, and covertly) to the gospels of St. Matthew, St. Luke, St. John, the Acts of the Apostles, and St. Paul's epistles. The writer was probably a Jewish believer, and may be supposed to be a Nazarene christian.

4. 'The Recognitions, and Clementine Homilies,' now interpolated, especially the former, were originally, as it seems, composed by an Ebionite, here being some marks of ill-will to the apostle Paul. They appear to have borrowed divers things from the gospels and the Acts.

Here end the two first volumes of former editions, containing a history of the catholic writers of the first two centuries, and a few others; some of them companions and disciples of the apostles, others in the next succession to them, and others afterwards. It cannot be thought that I have room to enlarge. Every one is able to recollect, that we have seen an ample testimony to most of the books of the New Testament now received by us; their antiquity and genuineness, as being written by those whose names they bear; and their authority, as written by inspired men, and containing an authentic account of Jesus Christ, and the doctrine taught by himself and his apostles; the rule of faith, worship, and manners, to christian people, who hope for the salvation promised by their Lord and Master.

We have seen a plain and express testimony to the four gospels, and the several writers of them by name, to the Acts of the Apostles written by Luke, one of the four evangelists, to St. Paul's epistles, all expressly mentioned, except the short epistle to Philemon, one epistle of Peter, and one epistle of John, and the book of the Revelation; and some notice of a second epistle of John, and the epistle of Jude.

Though many works of the primitive times of christianity have not come down to us, we have seen and examined a large number of works of learned christian writers, in Palestine, Syria, the countries of Asia Minor, Egypt, and that part of Africa that used the Latin tongue, and in Crete, Greece, Italy, and Gaul; all[g] in the space of about an hundred and fifty years after the writing of the first book

[g] It is generally supposed, that St. Paul's two epistles to the Thessalonians were written in the year of our Lord 52; and that they are the first written of all his epistles, which we have; and that they were written before the catholic epistles. It appears to me also very probable, that none of the gospels were written until after St. Paul's two epistles to the Thessalonians.

of the New Testament. In the remaining works of Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian, (though some works of each of them are lost,) there are perhaps more and larger quotations of the small volume of the New Testament, than of all the works of Cicero, though of so uncommon excellence for thought and style, in the writers of all characters for several ages; insomuch that we have reason to think a late learned and judicious divine[h] did not exaggerate beyond the truth, when he said, 'that the facts upon which the christian religion is founded have a stronger proof than any 'facts at such a distance of time; and that the books which 'convey them down to us may be proved to be uncorrupted 'and authentic, with greater strength than any other writings 'of equal antiquity.'

Ch. XXX. Marcus Minucius Felix, by some thought a native of Africa, a pleader of good repute at Rome, has left us an excellent defence of the christian religion, written in the form of a dialogue; a monument of the author's ingenuity, learning, and eloquence. There are in it references and allusions to several books of the New Testament; but no book is expressly named.

Ch. XXXI. Apollonius, whose station in life is not known, wrote a large work against the Montanists. By Eusebius we are assured, that he quoted the book of the Revelation. In the fragments of his work that remain, we perceive a reference or two to the gospel of St. Matthew: and it appears, that the apostles of Christ, and their writings, were in the highest esteem; and the books called by christians 'scripture,' in a strict and peculiar sense, were well known among them, and were considered as the rule of their faith and practice.

Ch. XXXII. Caius, a learned man, generally supposed a presbyter of Rome, had a dispute or conference in that city with Proculus a Montanist, which he afterwards published. Of that work some fragments are preserved in Eusebius; whereby we perceive, that Caius received but thirteen epistles of the apostle Paul, and rejected the book of the Revelation, and as some learned men think, ascribed it to Cerinthus.

In the same chapter is an account of a work ascribed by some to Caius, which we rather think to be anonymous: it was written against the heresy of Artemon. Here the 'divine scriptures,' of the New Testament, are manifestly distinguished by the author from the writings of 'the

[h] Dr. Jeremiah Hunt. See the Sermon upon occasion of his Death, at the latter part of the work.

'brethren,' or the most eminent and orthodox writers of the church after the apostles. It appears likewise, that the men whom he opposed appealed to the writings of the apostles for the truth of their opinions, and did not presume to assert any thing contrary to the doctrine of the apostles. Here likewise the followers of Artemon are vindicated from the charge of corrupting the scriptures.

Ch. XXXIII. Asterius Urbanus, author of a Treatise against the Montanists in three books. In the extracts of his work preserved in Eusebius there are marks of a peculiar respect for the scriptures, and divers incontestable references to the Acts of the Apostles: not to mention other things.

Ch. XXXIV. Alexander, chosen bishop of Jerusalem in 212, made two confessions at least, before heathen magistrates, and died in prison at Cæsarea, in the time of the emperor Decius, in 250 or 252. He wrote several letters, one to the church of Antioch. He erected a library at Jerusalem, and was a man of singular meekness. His merit and usefulness were very conspicuous: and it is to his honour, that he was a friend and favourer of Origen.

Ch. XXXV. Hippolytus, by some said to have been bishop of Portus Romanus in Italy, though indeed the place of his episcopate is not certainly known. He was a very learned man, and published many books, and wrote some Commentaries upon the scriptures. One of his books was Against all Heresies, to his own time: another was entitled, of the Revelation. He seems not to have received the epistle to the Hebrews as Paul's. In his few remaining works and fragments are quotations of the four gospels, the Acts, some of Paul's epistles, and the Revelation.

Ch. XXXVI. Ammonius of Alexandria, probably presbyter in that church, composed a Harmony of the four gospels, of which a particular account is given in this chapter.

Ch. XXXVII. Julius Africanus, an inhabitant of Palestine, author of a Chronological work in five books. He was a very learned man, and well acquainted with Origen: in a letter of his to Aristides is an uncommon attestation to the two gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke, and their several genealogies.

Ch. XXXVIII. Origen was born in Egypt in the year 184 or 185, and died in the sixty-ninth or seventieth year of his age, in the year of Christ 253: for a while he was catechist at Alexandria. In the year 228, Origen was sent into Achaia, upon some affair of the church, by Demetrius,

bishop of Alexandria. When he came to Cæsarea, in Palestine, he was ordained presbyter by Theoctistus bishop of that city and Alexander bishop of Jerusalem, when he was about 43 or 44 years of age: at which Demetrius, who before envied Origen, was greatly offended: so that Origen, after his return from Athens, being very uneasy at Alexandria, left that city, and went to reside at Cæsarea, in 230 or 231, as is supposed.

He received and often quotes the four gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John: or, as he expresseth it, p. 235, 'he had learned by tradition, that there are four gos-'pels, which alone are received without dispute by the 'whole church of God under heaven.' He likewise received and often quotes the Acts of the Apostles written by the evangelist Luke: in like manner thirteen epistles of the apostle Paul. About the epistle to the Hebrews there appears to have been doubts in his time, but he quotes it frequently as Paul's: though in one place he delivers his opinion, that the sentiments of the epistle only were the apostle's, the phrase and composition of some one else; whose he did not certainly know. He also received the first epistle of Peter, and the first of John. We perceive from him, that the epistle of James, the second of Peter, the second and third of John, and the epistle of Jude, were then well known, but not universally received; nor is it evident, that Origen himself received them as sacred scripture. He owns the book of the Revelation for the writing of John the apostle and evangelist: he quotes it as his without hesitation; nor does it appear, that he had any doubt about its genuineness and authority. The respect of this great man for the scriptures is very conspicuous. 'The 'gospels,' he says, 'were written exactly according to 'truth, with the assistance of the Holy Spirit.—The sacred 'books are not the writings of men, but have been writ-'ten and delivered to us from the inspiration of the Holy 'Spirit, by the will of the Father of all through Jesus 'Christ.' He does mightily recommend the reading of the scriptures of the Old and New Testament.

We have carefully examined his numerous quotations of ecclesiastical and apocryphal books; and I think it has appeared, that none of these were esteemed by him books of authority, from whence any doctrines may be proved, or scripture in the highest sense of that word. It is not evident, that Origen received, as sacred books of the New Testament, all that we now receive: but that he admitted no other, beside those in our present canon, may be reckon-

ed certain and indubitable. The consideration of that has added to the length of this chapter, the longest in the work: it is a material point; and, if it has been made out to satisfaction, it is worth all our labour and pains.

Besides, there are in this chapter many select passages conducive to promote virtue and piety, and proper to show the character of Origen and of the age in which he lived.

Here likewise is an account of Ambrose, Origen's friend and patron, and of Beryllus bishop of Bostra in Arabia, who once held the Unitarian doctrine, but is said to have been convinced by Origen.

Ch. XXXIX. Firmilian was ordained bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia about the year 233. He was a man of great piety and zeal for truth, and at the same time distinguished by his prudence and moderation. Though he seems not to have made any great figure as an author, he was well known in the world, and highly esteemed by his contemporaries and following ages. The only piece of his remaining is a letter to St. Cyprian bishop of Carthage, written in 256, or thereabouts; in which are references to the gospels of St. Matthew, St. Luke, and St. John, (if not also to St. Mark,) to the Acts of the Apostles, and divers of St. Paul's epistles, particularly that to the Romans, the Galatians, Ephesians, and Philippians, several of them as the apostle's. He quotes the first epistle of St. Peter, and probably refers to the first epistle of St. John: whether he refers to the second epistle of Peter, is not clear. It cannot be doubted, but Firmilian's canon was much the same as ours: it is plain, that our scriptures were then well known in Cappadocia. In particular, it should be observed, that the epistle of St. Paul to the churches of Galatia, and the first epistle of St. Peter, likewise addressed to christians in that country and near it, were received as genuine and divine scriptures by this learned and discreet bishop, who had his residence in those parts, or soon after.

Ch. XL. Divers writers in the former part of the third century.

Judas, who published a Commentary upon Daniel's seventy weeks. A. D. 202.

Anonymous Author of the Passion, or Acts of Perpetua and Felicitas, and others; which is an affecting account of them and some others who had the honour of martyrdom at Carthage, or some other place in Africa, during the persecution of the emperor Severus. A. D. 203.

Proculus, supposed a Montanist, wrote against the Valentinians. A. D. 212.

Geminianus, presbyter of the church of Antioch, author of divers books not now extant. A. D. 232.

Tryphon, a disciple of Origen, to whom several of his letters were written, published divers works, showing him to be very skilful in the scriptures, as we are assured by Jerom.

Ch. XLI. Noëtus, and others, called heretics, in the former part of the third century.

Noëtus of Smyrna, of the same opinion, which is better known by the name of Sabellianism. Philaster and Augustine say, it was the same opinion with that which had been before taught by Praxeas and Hermogenes. Theodoret says, Noëtus revived the heresy of Epigonus and Cleomenes, and that afterwards it was maintained by Callistus. It appears plainly from passages alleged in this article, that Noëtus and his followers received the same scriptures that other christians did, and had a like regard for them; though they did not understand them as some others did.

In this chapter follow brief accounts of divers people called Valesians, Angelics, Apostolics, Origenists: concerning whom it is not needful to repeat any thing here.

Ch. XLII. Theodore, afterwards called Gregory, disciple of Origen, was ordained bishop of Neocæsarea in Pontus, his native city and country, about the year 243. In his few remaining writings there are references to the gospels, and divers other books of the New Testament. Considering his acquaintance with Origen, and his respect for him, we may be assured, he had much the same canon of scripture with him: and indeed, in the little that remains of him, there are manifest proofs of his veneration for the scriptures of the Old and New Testament. There are several things in this chapter well worthy of observation. Gregory was five years with Origen at Cæsarea in Palestine: at parting with him, to return home, in 238 or 239, he composed a panegyrical oration, still extant, and recited it to a numerous audience. Near the beginning of the chapter is a brief abstract of that oration, which must be allowed to be a monument of the composer's eminent abilities, and demonstrates likewise Origen's excellent method of educating those who were under his care; which, indeed, is honourable to himself, and the christian profession of that age. I omit other things.

Ch. XLIII. Upon the promotion of Heraclas, after the death of Demetrius, to the bishopric of Alexandria, in 231 or 232, Dionysius, a disciple of Origen, succeeded him in the chair of the catechetical school of that city. Heraclas

having died in 246 or 247, Dionysius was chosen bishop in his room, in the year 247 or 248, and died in the twelfth of the emperor Gallienus, in the year of Christ 264, or at the utmost in 265, having been bishop seventeen years. He is reckoned the thirteenth bishop of Alexandria.

The sum of his testimony to the N. T. is this: He received, as sacred and divine scripture, the four gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, all expressly quoted by him, with the names of the several evangelists: the Acts of the Apostles also expressly quoted: the epistles of Paul, and particularly the epistle to the Hebrews, as a writing of that apostle. Concerning the catholic epistles we do not certainly know his judgment; but he has mentioned expressly, several times, the three epistles of the apostle John; one as unquestionably genuine, the other two as well known: and it may be justly taken for granted, that he received the first epistle of the apostle Peter, it having been all along universally received by catholic christians: as for the rest, we can say nothing positively of his opinion about them. The Revelation, upon which he has a long critical argument, he allowed to be the work of John, a holy and divinely inspired man; but he was not satisfied that it was written by John the son of Zebedee, apostle and evangelist: he was rather inclined to think it the writing of some other John, who also had his chief residence in Asia. However from his argument concerning that book it appears, that it was then very generally received by christians as written by the evangelist John. In Dionysius are evidences of the peculiar respect shown by christians in general to the sacred scriptures, which they looked upon as the rule of judgment in things of religion, by which all points in controversy were to be decided. What those scriptures were, he shows by these general titles and divisions, 'the law and the pro-'phets, the gospels and epistles of apostles.' Nor have we perceived in the remaining works of this eminent bishop of Alexandria any marks of respect for christian apocryphal writings.

Dionysius was a very learned man, distinguished likewise by an excellent temper, and much moderation, and he was in great repute. In his time arose divers controversies, in which he had a large share. He wrote several letters on account of the Novatianism, which arose about 251; the baptism of heretics, about which there was a dispute between Stephen of Rome and Cyprian of Carthage, about 256. Sabellius, with whom likewise Dionysius was concerned, was of Africa, probably bishop of Ptolemais: his

peculiar opinions were first known about 256. It appears, that he received the scriptures of the Old and New Testament as other christians did, and argued from them for his opinions. Paul of Samosata was ordained bishop of Antioch in 260, deposed by a council in 269, but not removed before 272 or 273. He likewise, so far as we can perceive, agreed with other christians in a respect for the scriptures: both these men embraced the Unitarian doctrine concerning the Deity. The number of Millenarians in the province of Arsinoe, in Egypt, occasioned a public conference, and Dionysius's two books, 'Concerning the Promises,' from which large extracts have been made, containing the above argument upon the Revelation. In those books 'Of the Promises' he opposed a book of Nepos, an Egyptian Bishop, entitled a 'Confutation of the Allegorists,' in which he endeavoured to support his opinion concerning the Millennium from the Revelation. It may deserve our notice, that Nepos was dead when Dionysius wrote against him; which affords an argument, that the book of the Revelation had been for some time received in Egypt as a part of sacred scripture.

Ch. XLIV. St. Cyprian, or Thascius Cæcilius Cyprianus, a native of Africa, whether of Carthage is not certain, who in the former part of his life had taught rhetoric at Carthage with great applause; in 245 or 246 embraced the christian religion, being convinced by the arguments proposed to him by Cæcilius, presbyter of the church of Carthage, and at that time venerable for his age. After no long time Cyprian was made presbyter and bishop of Carthage, in 248 or 249: in September 258 he had the honour to die a martyr, at a place about six miles from Carthage, in the time of the emperor Valerian. The four gospels are frequently quoted by him: he compares them to the four rivers of paradise. The Acts of the Apostles likewise are frequently and expressly quoted by him, with that title; but I do not remember that he has any where mentioned the name of the writer. He has quoted all the thirteen epistles of St. Paul, except the epistle to Philemon; which may have been omitted for no other reason but that he had no particular occasion to quote it. We find not in him any quotations of the epistle to the Hebrews; and it is probable, that it was not received by him. The first epistle of St. Peter, and the first epistle of St. John, are often and expressly quoted by him. It is reasonable to suppose, that the second epistle of the same apostle was received by him, because it is expressly cited by one of the bishops in the

council of Carthage, held in 256, of which Cyprian was a principal part. There is no particular quotation in his works of the third epistle of St. John; but considering its shortness, and that the other two are expressly mentioned, there seems not to be any good reason for supposing it to have been unknown to him, or rejected by him. We find in him no quotations or allusions to the epistle of St. James, nor any notice taken by him of the second epistle of St. Peter, or the epistle of St. Jude. The book of the Revelation is frequently quoted by Cyprian as written by John, and as a book of authority; but he has no where expressly said, that he was John the apostle and evangelist; however, he may be justly understood to mean him. Excepting those few above specified, all the books of the New Testament now received by us, have an ample testimony given to them in the works of St. Cyprian: they were publicly read and expounded in the assemblies of christian people, and were esteemed the rule of their faith and practice. The books on which he relies for deciding controverted points are included in these general divisions: 'the evangelic and 'apostolic authority: the gospels and the epistles of the 'apostles.' Again, 'Whence is that tradition? Does it 'descend from the authority of the Lord and the gospels? 'or does it come from the commandments and epistles of 'the apostles? For those things ought to be done which 'are written.' Afterwards, 'the gospel, and the epistles, 'and Acts:' from whence we perceive, that all the books of the New Testament were then contained in two codes, or volumes; one called 'the gospels,' or 'scriptures of the 'Lord,' the other 'the apostle,' or the 'epistles of the apos-'tles.' In which latter division was usually placed the book of the Acts: nor is there in this celebrated African bishop of the third century, one quotation of any christian spurious or apocryphal writings.

Ch. XLV. Writings ascribed to Cyprian, or joined with his works.

1. Cyprian's Life and Passion, written by his deacon Pontius: here Pontius has quoted the gospels of St. Matthew, St. Luke, and St. John, and several of St. Paul's epistles, and the book of the Acts of the Apostles expressly by that title. There is no need to be more particular, since it may be taken for granted, that this deacon's canon of scripture was the same with his bishop's.

2. 'Of Shows.' An epistle of an unknown author: he seems to have been a bishop. He calls the scriptures of the New Testament 'sacred writings, divine scriptures,' and

'heavenly scriptures;' and says, 'That a good christian 'ought to employ himself in diligent reading the scrip-'tures.'

3. 'Of Discipline, and the Benefit of Chastity.' The writer was a bishop: he has cited the words of divers books of the New Testament: he shows great respect for them, and recommends to his people the study of the scriptures.

4. The third piece, sometimes ascribed to Cyprian, is entitled 'Of the Praise of Martyrdom.' Though it is not Cyprian's, it is ancient, as are the other two already rehearsed. Here are cited passages of divers books of the New Testament, particularly of the four gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, and several of St. Paul's epistles. It deserves to be considered likewise, whether he has not references to the epistle to the Hebrews, and the book of the Revelation.

5. 'Against the Novatian Heretic,' another tract of an unknown writer. He abounds with quotations of scripture: he has cited texts of all the gospels, except St. Mark's; and likewise divers of St. Paul's epistles, and the first epistle of St. John, the epistle of St. Jude, and the Revelation. In a short compass he has given many proofs of a high respect for the books of the New Testament, and the doctrine contained therein.

6. 'Of the Baptism of Heretics.' The work of a bishop, contemporary with Cyprian, and of a different opinion from him: who has largely quoted the gospels, the Acts of the Apostles expressly, and divers of the epistles of the New Testament, and passed a sharp censure upon the book called the 'Preaching of Peter,' or 'Paul,' or both of them.

7. 'A Computation of Easter.' Unquestionably ancient, though the name of the writer is not known; and it is valuable for the testimonies which it contains to some facts, as well as to the books of the New Testament. The writer expressly says, there are 'four gospels,' or, as another copy has it, 'evangelists, and twelve apostles; and that the gos-'pel is one, divided into four parts.' He has a remarkable quotation of the book of the Acts, showing, that it was esteemed divine scripture, and was well known. He also quotes the Revelation, and says, 'We are built upon the words of the apostles.'

Ch. XLVI. Cornelius and Lucius, bishops of Rome.

Cornelius wrote several letters, of which there is an account in Eusebius and Jerom: of which likewise we have taken notice in this and the following chapter concerning

his rival Novatus. It ought to be observed, that in a letter of Cornelius to Fabius bishop of Antioch, he says, 'There 'were in the church of Rome seven deacons, and seven sub-'deacons:' which affords reason to think, that the church of Rome now received the book of the Acts; and that in this case they showed a respect to the number of deacons first chosen in the church of Jerusalem. See Acts vi.

Ch. XLVII. Novatus presbyter of Rome, rival of Cornelius, and author of a sect called after his name. In a letter of the clergy of Rome, written during the vacancy of the see after the death of Fabian, allowed to have been drawn up by Novatus, are these expressions: 'Otherwise the 'apostle had not so commended us, saying, "That your 'faith is spoken of throughout the whole world,"' Rom. i. 8. In the remaining works of this author there are many quotations of the books of the New Testament, and marks of a peculiar respect for the scriptures; but it is probable, that the epistle to the Hebrews was not received by him as St. Paul's.

In this chapter is likewise an account of divers men of note and eminence among the Novatians; and it is shown, that this people had all along the same canon with the catholic christians, in the several countries where they lived.

Ch. XLVIII. Dionysius bishop of Rome succeeded Xystus, or Sixtus the Second, who suffered martyrdom under the emperors Valerian and Gallienus. He is spoken of by Eusebius as a learned and admirable man: he wrote several letters upon occasion of Sabellianism, and other controversies. From his remaining fragments we perceive the concurrence of this bishop of Rome with other christians of that time, in acknowledging the 'divine scriptures,' and the 'divine oracles,' to be the rule of faith, by which all doctrines were to be tried: he likewise, as well as others, teaches us where those oracles are to be found, namely, in the 'Old and New Testament;' which contain all the scriptures that were esteemed, in the strictest sense, sacred and divine.

Ch. XLIX. Commodian, a Latin, probably an African, a learned man, once a heathen, afterwards a zealous christian, though a layman only, has left us a book entitled, 'In-'structions,' in a style between verse and prose; wherein are quoted many books of the New Testament. He refers all men to the law, that is, the scriptures, in order to their understanding religion. It is pleasing to observe this high

respect for scripture running through the writings of all early christians in general.

Ch. L. Malchion, some time, as it seems, a heathen, who taught rhetoric at Antioch, afterwards presbyter of the church in that city under Paul of Samosata. There are in this chapter divers remarks, to which the reader is referred: I do not think it needful to transcribe them here.

Ch. LI. Anatolius and three others, bishops of Laodicea in Syria. A. D. 270.

Anatolius, a native of Alexandria, bishop of Laodicea, was a man of uncommon learning, and in great repute with the people of Alexandria, so long as he lived there: having great skill in philosophy and the Greek literature, and being a complete master of arithmetic, geometry, logic, and rhetoric. He published a work concerning Easter, and also the Principles of Arithmetic in ten books, and likewise other works, monuments of his diligence in studying the divine scriptures, and of his understanding therein, as we are assured by Eusebius.

The history of the other three bishops of Laodicea, in this chapter, is of use to represent the state of christianity at that time.

Ch. LII. Theognostus, a learned Alexandrian, remarkable, as for other things deserving notice, so particularly for affording us an early testimony to the epistle to the Hebrews. A. D. 282.

Ch. LIII. Theonas was bishop of Alexandria about nineteen years. After Dionysius, of whom before, was Maximus, next Theonas, about 282, who was succeeded by Peter, of whom hereafter. In a letter ascribed to Theonas are mentioned 'the gospel and apostle,' as divine oracles. The writer also recommends the daily reading the sacred scriptures, as the best means of improving the mind in every virtue.

Ch. LIV. 'Pierius,' says Jerom, 'presbyter of the church 'of Alexandria, taught the people with great reputation in 'the time of the emperors Carus and Dioclesian, when 'Theonas was bishop of that church. Such was the ele-'gance of his discourses and treatises, that he was called 'the younger Origen. And Eusebius says, he was cele-'brated for his strict course of life, and philosophical learn-'ing. He was likewise admired for his diligence in the 'study of the scriptures, and his expositions of them, and 'his public discourses to the people.' None of his works remain: but from what has been just now seen by us, we

can conclude, that in his time he adorned the christian profession by his piety, learning, and public labours. His canon of scripture may be supposed to have been the same as Origen's, or very little different.

Ch. LV. 'Dorotheus,' says Eusebius, 'presbyter of the 'church of Antioch, a learned man, whom we knew; he was 'very studious in the sacred scriptures, and acquainted 'himself so far with Hebrew, as to be able to read the an-'cient scriptures in their own language with understanding: 'he was a man of a liberal mind, [or of high birth,] and 'was not unskilled in Greek literature.' Which shows, that christianity did not discourage useful knowledge: though we have here, and often elsewhere, occasion to observe, that the scriptures were their principal study.

In this chapter is added an account of a late and fabulous author, called Dorotheus, whose work is entitled, 'A Sy-'nopsis of the Life and Death of the Prophets, and also of the 'Apostles and Disciples of Jesus Christ.'

Ch. LVI. Victorinus bishop of Pettaw upon the Drave, in Germany, had the honour to die a martyr for Christ in the persecution of Dioclesian, and, as is supposed, in the year 303. 'He wrote,' as Jerom says, 'Commentaries upon 'Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Ezekiel, Habakkuk, Ecclesi-'astes, the Canticles, and the Revelation of John, Against all 'Heresies, and many other works: at last he was crowned 'with martyrdom.' In his remaining works and fragments are expressly quoted the four evangelists, with the beginnings of their several gospels: he likewise quotes expressly the Acts of the Apostles: he speaks of the seven churches to which Paul wrote, the Romans, the Corinthians, the Galatians, the Ephesians, the Philippians, the Colossians, the Thessalonians. Afterwards, as he says, Paul wrote to particular persons, undoubtedly meaning Timothy, Titus, and Philemon. So that he received thirteen epistles of the apostle Paul. Whether also that to the Hebrews is doubtful; though there are in him some expressions, in which he may be thought to refer, or allude to that epistle: he has quoted the first epistle of Peter: he supposed that John had his revelation in Patmos, where he had been condemned to the mines by the emperor Domitian; and that his gospel was written still later. 'Afterwards,' says he, 'he wrote 'his gospel. When Valentinus, and Cerinthus, and Ebion, 'and others of the school of Satan, were spread over the 'world, many from the neighbouring provinces came to 'him, and earnestly entreated him to put down his testi-'mony in writing.' These are the books of the New Testa-

ment, of which we perceive express notice in him. There might be other books received by him, though not expressly mentioned in his few remaining works: unquestionably he received all those scriptures, which were generally received by christians in all times, and over all the world.

In this chapter are also extracts from a poem in five books against Marcion, sometimes ascribed to Victorinus, though probably not his, usually joined with Tertullian's works. This writer distinctly mentions the four evangelists, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John: he expressly quotes several of St. Paul's epistles, and refers to others among them, to the Hebrews several times: he likewise frequently quotes the Revelation as written by John, the disciple and apostle of Christ.

Ch. LVII. 'Methodius,' says Jerom, 'bishop of Olympus 'in Lycia, a man of a neat and correct style, composed a 'work against Porphyry in several books.—He also wrote 'Commentaries upon Genesis, and the Canticles, and many 'other works.—He obtained the crown of martyrdom at the 'end of the last persecution,' meaning Dioclesian's.

His testimony to the books of the New Testament is to this purpose: He expressly says, 'there have been four 'gospels delivered to us.' He refers to the Acts. He has quoted or alluded to many of St. Paul's epistles, particularly that to the Hebrews. In his remaining works there is little notice taken of the catholic epistles; though, unquestionably, he received the first of Peter, and the first of John: the Revelation is often quoted by him.

There are in him clear proofs, that the scriptures of the New Testament, generally received by christians, were well known, much used, and highly esteemed, being books of authority, and appealed to in all points of dispute and controversy. I have not observed in this Greek writer of the third century, any quotations of christian apocryphal writings; nor do his works afford any the least ground to suppose, that there were any writings of ancient christian authors, that were esteemed sacred and of authority, beside those which are now generally received as such by us, namely, the writings of apostles and evangelists.

Ch. LVIII. Lucian, presbyter of Antioch, as Eusebius writes, 'celebrated for his piety and his knowledge of the 'scriptures, was carried from Antioch to Nicomedia, where 'the emperor [Maximin] then was; and having made an 'apology before the governor for the doctrine professed by 'him, was sent to prison, and there put to death.' He and Hesychius, probably of Egypt, published an edition of the

Greek version of the Old Testament, called that of the Seventy, and likewise an edition of the New Testament: but their editions seem not to have been much esteemed.

Ch. LIX. Pamphilus, presbyter in the church of Cæsarea, admirer of Origen, and friend of Eusebius, afterwards bishop of that church, had the honour of martyrdom, in the persecution begun by Dioclesian. He was put in prison in 307, and accomplished his testimony in 309, 'a man, who,' as his friend, our ecclesiastical historian, says, 'throughout 'his whole life excelled in every virtue; but was especially 'eminent and remarkable for an unfeigned zeal for the holy 'scriptures, and for unwearied application in whatever he 'undertook.'—'If he saw any in straits he gave bountifully, 'as he was able: he not only lent out copies of the sacred 'scriptures to be read, but he cheerfully gave them to be 'kept; and that not only to men, but to women likewise, 'whom he found disposed to read; for which reason he 'took care to have by him many copies of the scriptures, 'that when there should be occasion he might furnish those 'who were willing to make use of them.' His canon of scripture may be supposed to be the same with that of Origen and Eusebius. Pamphilus erected a library at Cæsarea, which he furnished at great expense with manuscript copies of the scriptures, and of the works of Origen and other ecclesiastical writers: of which library great care was afterwards taken by the bishops of Cæsarea; by which means it was kept up and subsisted in good order for a great while.

Besides Pamphilus, the history of some others is related in this chapter, who were remarkable for their affection for the revealed will and word of God. 'The second person, 'and next after Pamphilus, was Valens, a deacon of Ælia, '[that is, Jerusalem,] an old man,' says Eusebius, 'of grey 'hairs, and venerable aspect, exceedingly well skilled in 'the divine scriptures; and they were so fixed in his 'memory, that there was no discernible difference between 'his reading and reciting them by heart, though it were 'whole pages together.' That person suffered with Pamphilus.

Afterwards, among divers other martyrs in 310, was John, who had lost his sight, 'who,' as Eusebius goes on, 'in 'strength of memory surpassed all men of our time.—He 'had whole books of the divine scriptures, not written in 'tables of stone, nor on parchments and papers, which 'are devoured by moths and time, but on the living 'tables of his heart, even his pure and enlightened mind;

'insomuch that whenever he pleased, he brought out, as 'from a treasury of knowledge, sometimes the books of 'Moses, at other times those of the prophets, or some 'sacred history, sometimes the gospels, sometimes the epis-'tles of the apostles. I must own,' says the historian, 'that 'I was much surprised the first time I saw him: he was in 'the midst of a large congregation, reciting a portion of 'scripture. Whilst I only heard his voice, I thought he was 'reading, as is common in our assemblies; but when I 'came near and saw this person, who had no other light 'but that of the mind, instructing like a prophet those 'whose bodily eyes were clear and perfect, I could not for-'bear to praise and glorify God.'

Ch. LX. Phileas, bishop of Thmuis in Egypt, was a man of noble family, and great estate. There is in Eusebius a part of a letter of his, quoting divers books of the New Testament, and showing great regard for the scriptures. He and Philoromus, who had been the emperor's receiver-general, were beheaded at Alexandria, in the same persecution, in the year 311, or 312, by order of the emperor Maximin.

Ch. LXI. In the year of Christ 300 Peter succeeded Theonas at Alexandria. Eusebius says, 'he obtained great 'honour during his episcopate, which he held twelve years: 'he governed the church three years before the persecu-'tion.—In the ninth year of the persecution he was beheaded, 'and obtained the crown of martyrdom.' In another place the same historian says, 'About the same time Peter also, 'an ornament of the episcopal character, both for the holi-'ness of his life, and his laborious application in studying 'and explaining the scriptures,—was on a sudden ap-'prehended and beheaded.' I forbear to transcribe any thing here from his writings.

Ch. LXII. A work ascribed to Archelaus bishop of Mesopotamia, containing an account of a conference with Mani, and his principles: which work probably was composed near the beginning of the fourth century. Herein are quoted the gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, and divers of St. Paul's epistles; and there are references to the epistle to the Hebrews.

Ch. LXIII. Here is a history of Mani and his followers, who is supposed first to have appeared as author of a sect near the end of the third century, and a large though not complete account of their principles and worship, and their doctrine concerning the scriptures: in which last, exactness has been aimed at. These people always rejected the

Old Testament: they received the New Testament, and had a great deal of respect for it. They seemed to have received all the books of the New Testament, generally received by other christians at that time, excepting the book of the Acts, which may have been rejected by some, but not by all of them. See vol. iii. sect. vi. They said, that the books of the New Testament had been corrupted and interpolated; but they never produced any copies different from those in the hands of the catholics. They likewise made use of apocryphal books; but it does not appear that they forged any books; they only made use of such apocryphal books as they found written before by some others of like sentiments with themselves.

Here also is an account of the Paulicians in the seventh century, a branch of the same sect. They likewise rejected the Old Testament, and used only the gospels and the apostles. In particular they are said to have received the four gospels, and the fourteen epistles of Paul, and the epistle of James, and the three epistles of John, and the epistle of Jude, and the Acts of the Apostles, without making any alteration in them; but they admitted not the two epistles of the chief of the apostles.. What was their sentiment concerning the Revelation we cannot say. One thing more should be observed of this people: they greatly respected the scriptures of the New Testament, and approved that all the laity, and even women, should read, study, and understand them.

In the inquiries that have been made concerning the scriptures received by the Manichees, and the respect they had for them, there are many observations concerning the genuineness and authority of the books of the New Testament, and concerning the apocryphal books made use of by the Manichees, and by some other sects of a more early original.

Moreover in this chapter is an account of two learned catholic bishops, who wrote against the Manichees: one of which is Serapion, bishop of Thmuis in Egypt about the year 347. He quotes the gospels, the Acts, divers of St. Paul's epistles, particularly that to the Hebrews. See vol. iii. p. 271.

The other is Titus bishop of Bostra, about 362. He frequently quotes the gospels and the epistles of St. Paul, particularly that to the Hebrews: he likewise quotes the Acts of the Apostles: he has little or nothing out of the catholic epistles, or the Apocalypse. See vol. iii. p. 272, 273. Some remarkable quotations of the Acts made by him may be seen, vol. iii. p. 400.

We have been likewise induced to give here an account of Hierax, about 302, a native of Egypt, falsely supposed to have been a Manichee. Though he had some errors, he received the Old and New Testament. He was in divers respects a very extraordinary person: he had the scriptures of the Old and New Testament by heart, and wrote Commentaries upon several parts of them. He received the epistle to the Hebrews as Paul's. See vol. iii. p. 286—288.

Ch. LXIV. Arnobius, once a heathen, who in the time of Dioclesian taught rhetoric at Sicca in Africa with great reputation; and when converted composed a work in seven books, Against the Gentiles, or an Apology for the Christian Religion. As Arnobius's work is very curious, the extracts out of him cannot but afford entertainment to intelligent readers. He seems not to have judged it proper to quote the books of the New Testament in an argument with Gentiles: nevertheless he has enumerated our Saviour's miracles in such a manner, as shows him to have been well acquainted with our gospels, and to have had a great regard for them. He seems likewise to refer to the Acts of the Apostles, and some of St. Paul's epistles.

At the end of this chapter is also an account of another Arnobius, who about the year 460 wrote a Commentary upon the book of Psalms. He quotes the commonly received books of the New Testament, particularly the Acts of the Apostles, and also the epistle to the Hebrews, the epistle of James, and the Revelation; and he recommends the frequent reading of the scriptures.

Ch. LXV. Lactantius, the most learned Latin of his time, and as polite and elegant a writer as any among the christians, and therefore sometimes called, 'the Christian Cicero,' expressly quotes St. John's gospel, and the book of the Revelation; and has allusions to many other books of the New Testament. He plainly had a collection of scriptures, consisting of the Old and the New Testament, which he esteemed sacred and divine, and of the highest authority. If he had not purposely restrained himself from quoting the christian scriptures in his arguments with heathens, his testimony would have been much more full and particular. For, notwithstanding the reservedness which he imposed upon himself in that respect, there are many allusions and references to them; which seems to show, that the christians of that time were so habituated to the language of scripture, that it was not easy for them to avoid the use of it, whenever they discoursed upon things of a religious nature. There are in him likewise quotations of the Sibyl-

line books, and some other writings; but it is evident that he was far from esteeming them of canonical authority. Besides, there are in this chapter extracted many passages of Lactantius upon divers subjects; which must be allowed to be an ornament to this work.

Ch. LXVI. Of burning the scriptures, and of traitors in the time of Dioclesian's persecution.

Eusebius assures us, that in the Imperial edict in 303, it was expressly ordered, not only that the christian churches should be demolished, but likewise, that their scriptures should be burned. This was one of the affecting scenes of that persecution, that he had seen the sacred and divine scriptures burned in market places. Notice is taken of the same thing by other writers. A farther account of it may be seen in that chapter.

Ch. LXVII. The Donatists, a large body of men, who, about the year 312, separated from the catholics in Africa, under pretence that Cæcilian bishop of Carthage had been ordained by bishops who in the time of the persecution had betrayed the scriptures and other sacred things into the hands of the heathens, received the same scriptures which other christians received, particularly the book of the Revelation, and had a like respect for them.

In this chapter may be seen a brief account of several Donatist authors and their works; by which it appears, that the Donatists were not concerned for the interest of their own party only, but employed themselves likewise in the defence of the common cause of christianity against its enemies.

Ch. LXVIII. Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, in whose time arose the Arian controversy, upon that occasion wrote several epistles. He quotes expressly St. John's gospel, and several of St. Paul's epistles, particularly that to the Hebrews, and the second epistle of St. John.

Ch. LXIX. Arius, presbyter of Alexandria, well known in the world, about the year 316. He and his followers received the same scriptures with other christians, and showed them a like regard.

In this chapter is an account of several writers of the fourth and fifth centuries, who went under the denomination of Arians, eminent men, and remarkable for their learning and their works, particularly their Commentaries upon the scriptures. But here I can do little more than mention their names: 1. Acacius, who succeeded Eusebius in the see of Cæsarea in 340, and died about the year 366. 2. Aëtius. 3. An anonymous author of a Commentary upon

the book of Job. 4. An author of a Discourse in Augustine's works. 5. Asterius. 6. Basil of Ancyra. 7. Eunomius, bishop of Cyzicum about 360: concerning whom it may be here taken notice of to his honour, though omitted formerly, that[1] he opposed the extreme veneration which was then begun to be shown to the reliques of martyrs; as we learn from Jerom in his book against Vigilantius. 8. Eusebius, bishop of Emesa, about 340. 9. Eusebius, at first bishop of Berytus, about 324, then of Nicomedia, the chief city of Bithynia, afterwards of Constantinople in 338 or 339, died about 341. 10. Euzoius, bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine, about 366. 11. George, bishop of Laodicea, about the year 340. 12. Lucius, bishop of Alexandria, after Athanasius, in 373. 13. Maximin, an Arian bishop in Africa, with whom Augustine had a public conference, about 428. 14. Philostorgius, about 425, well known for his Ecclesiastical History. 15. Sabinus, about 380, author of a History of Councils. 16. Theodore, bishop of Heraclea in Thrace, about 334, author of Commentaries upon the Psalms, the gospels of Matthew and John, and divers if not all of St. Paul's epistles. 17. Ulphilas, about 365, bishop of the Goths, who translated into their language the scriptures of the Old and New Testament, excepting only, as is said, the books of the Kingdoms.

Ch. LXX. Constantine the Great, the first christian emperor, son of Flavius Valerius Constantius, surnamed Chlorus, was born at Naissus in Illyricum, in 273 or 274, and succeeded his father in 306. Having reigned above thirty years, he died, May 22, 337. About the year 312 he embraced the christian religion, of which he continued ever after to make an open profession, and educated his children in the same belief. I forbear to rehearse here his several edicts in favour of the christians. Besides other marks of respect for the scriptures, when he had enlarged the city of Byzantium, and consecrated it by the name of Constantinople, he wrote a letter to Eusebius, bishop of Cæsarea, requiring him to send him fifty copies of the scriptures for the use of the churches there, and to take care that they should be written upon fine parchment by such as were skilful in the art of fair writing, and that they should be portable and fit for use.

Ch. LXXI. In 325 was assembled the council of Nice,

[1] Rides de reliquiis martyrum, et cum auctore hujus hæreseos Eunomio, ecclesiis Christi calumniam struis; nec tali societate terreris, ut eadem contra nos loquaris, quæ ille contra ecclesiam loquitur. Adv. Vigilant. T. iv. p. 285. in.

of which a brief history has been given, with divers free observations. There is not any catalogue of the books of scripture in their canons.

Ch. LXXII. Eusebius was born about the year 270, and probably at Cæsarea in Palestine, of which place he was made bishop in 315, and died in 339 or 340. From him it appears, that the number of the books of the New Testament was not then settled by any authority that was universally allowed of. But the books following were universally received: the four gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, thirteen epistles of Paul, one epistle of Peter, and one epistle of John. These were universally received by christians in his time, and had been all along received by the elders and churches of former times. Beside these, we now generally receive also an epistle to the Hebrews, an epistle of James, a second epistle of Peter, a second and third of John, an epistle of Jude, and the Revelation. And we perceive from this learned writer, that these books or epistles were then well known, and next in esteem to those before mentioned as universally acknowledged, and were more generally received as of authority, than any other controverted writings. Beside these, there was the gospel according to the Hebrews, made use of by the Jewish believers; being, probably, a translation of St. Matthew's gospel, with some additions, and, as it seems, containing little or nothing contrary to the genuine doctrine of Christ and his apostles. The book, called the Doctrine or Doctrines of the Apostles, (first mentioned by Eusebius, and by no other writer before him,) we have not now a distinct knowledge of; but, probably, it was a small book, containing the rudiments of the christian religion, and fitted for the use of young people and new converts, and never esteemed a part of sacred scripture. Some others there were which were reckoned useful, as the epistle of Barnabas, the epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, and the Shepherd of Hermas; but they were not esteemed to be of authority, and a part of sacred and canonical scripture. Beside these, he mentions also the gospels of Peter, Thomas, and Matthias, Acts of Peter, Acts of Paul, Acts of Andrew and John, the Preaching of Peter, and Revelation of Peter, which, he says, vol. iv. p. 98, are the forgeries of heretics, and are to be rejected as altogether spurious and impious: nor have any of the ecclesiastical writers, as he adds, vouchsafed to make mention of them in their writings. He farther bears witness, that to the books of the Old and New Testament, universally received, the greatest respect was shown. They

were esteemed of authority, and decisive in all points of a religious nature: they were publicly read and explained in the assemblies of christian people, and they were open to be freely read by all sorts of persons in private, for their instruction and improvement in religious knowledge, and their edification in virtue. They were now also translated into many languages; for he says, vol. iv. p. 144, that Greeks and Barbarians had the scriptures concerning Jesus in their own letters and dialect. Finally, it may be observed, that this learned author makes little use in his works of apocrypnal scriptures of the Old Testament: none at all of christian writings forged with the names of Christ's apostles, or their companions.

Upon the whole, the chapter of this bishop of Cæsarea, with the select passages alleged from him, and his several passages concerning the books of the New Testament, and observations upon them, may be reckoned as important a chapter as any in this work, if not the principal of all. As such, it is recommended to the consideration of those who are desirous to form a right judgment concerning the evidences there are of the genuineness, antiquity, and authority of the books of the New Testament now received by us.

Ch. LXXIII. Marcellus, a learned man, bishop of Ancyra in Galatia, was present at the council of Nice in 325. In 334 or 335, he published a book against Asterius and other Arians; whereby he brought upon himself a charge of Sabellianism or Unitarianism, for which he was deposed by the Arians in a council held at Constantinople in 336, and Basil was put in his room. He appears to have received the scriptures of the Old and New Testament as other christians did, and to have had the same respect for them.

Ch. LXXIV. Eustathius, bishop of Antioch, and a principal part of the council of Nice, author of divers works, (some written against the Arian doctrine by the intrigues of Eusebius of Nicomedia, and those who adhered to him,) was deposed by a synod at Antioch in the year 328, or soon after, as a Sabellian, and otherwise unworthy of the pastoral office: after which he was banished. As little of him remains, we can only say, that he received the same scriptures which other christians did.

Ch. LXXV. Athanasius succeeded Alexander in the see of Alexandria in the year 326, and died in 373, when he had been bishop 46 years complete. From his Festal Epistle, and his other works, he appears to have received, as divine scripture, all the same books of the New Testa-

ment which we do, and no other: the four gospels, the Acts of the Apostles written by Luke, the seven catholic epistles, fourteen epistles of the apostle Paul, and the Revelation. Beside these, there are others of which he speaks, as being 'without, not canonical,' but allowed to be read by those who are newly converted, and are desirous to be instructed in the doctrines of religion. He mentions but two only, the Doctrine of the Apostles, and the Shepherd, meaning Hermas. Afterwards at the end of his Festal Epistle he speaks of apocryphal books, which he censures in general, as the 'inventions,' or forgeries, 'of heretics;' but does not name any one of them. So at the end of the Festal Epistle: and at the beginning of it he cautions men 'not to be 'seduced to make use of books called apocryphal, being[k] 'deceived by the similitude of their names, resembling the 'true or genuine books.' By which expressions we are led to think, he intends books forged in the names of the apostles of Christ, and their companions; whose titles we find in Eusebius, and other ancient writers. His general divisions of scriptures, which were of authority, are such as these: 'Gospels and apostles: gospel, apostles, and pro-'phets.' The sufficiency of these scriptures is strongly declared by him. Having enumerated the canonical books of the Old and New Testament, he adds, vol. iv. p. 52, 'These are fountains of salvation, that he who thirsts may 'be satisfied with the oracles contained in them. In these 'alone the doctrine of salvation is proclaimed: let no man 'add to them, or take any thing from them.' Condemning the multitude of Arian synods of that age, he says, 'The[l] 'divine scripture is fully sufficient: but if there be any 'occasion for a synod, let them observe the determinations 'of the Council of Nice,' vol. iv. p. 160. It may be worth while to observe likewise, that he useth the word 'canoni-'cal:' it occurs several times in his Festal Epistle. The 'books[m] delivered down to them, and believed to be divine 'scripture,' he calls 'canonical books.' Others[n] he speaks of as 'without,' or 'not in the canon, though allowed to be 'read:' the rest are apocryphal. And in another work, speaking of the Shepherd of Hermas, he says, 'it[o] was not 'in the canon.'

[k] Απατωμενοι τη ὁμωνυμια των αληθινων βιβλιων. Quoted vol. iv. p. 154.

[l] Εστι μεν γαρ ικανωτερα παντων ἡ θεια γραφη, κ. λ. Citat. vol. iv. p. 159.

[m] — τα κανονιζομενα, και παραδοθεντα, πιστευθεντα τε θεια ειναι βιβλια. Vol. iv. p. 154.

[n] — και ἑτερα βιβλια τουτων εξωθεν· ου κανονιζομενα μεν—και τουτων κανονιζομενων, και τουτων αναγινωσκομενων. Vol. iv. p. 155.

[o] Καιτοι μη ον εκ του κανονος. Cit. vol. iv. p. 159.

This testimony of Athanasius to the scriptures is very valuable. It appears from his Festal Epistle, and also from his other works, that he received all the books of the New Testament that we do, and no other, as of authority: and considering the time in which he lived, the acquaintance he had with the several parts of the christian church, and the bishops of it, in Egypt and its neighbourhood, in Europe, and Asia, and the knowledge he had of ancient christian writings, it must be of great use to satisfy us, that notwithstanding the frequent quotations of other books in the writings of divers ancient christians, they did always make a distinction, and did not design to allege as of authority, and a part of the rule of faith, any books but those which were in the highest sense sacred and divine.

In the same chapter is an account of the Synopsis of sacred scripture, sometimes ascribed to Athanasius, but probably not written till above a century after his time. It is, in the main, agreeable to what we have just seen in Athanasius: but for particulars the reader is referred to the chapter itself.

Ch. LXXVI. A Dialogue against the Marcionites, ascribed to Adamantius, whoever he was. In this work are cited the four gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, most of St. Paul's epistles, particularly that to the Hebrews, and the second epistle of St. Peter. He computes St. Mark and St. Luke to have been two of our Saviour's seventy disciples.

Ch. LXXVII. C. Vettius Juvencus, a Spaniard of a good family in the time of the emperor Constantine, published a work in hexameter verse in four books, containing the history of our Lord, as recorded in the four gospels. A. D. 330.

Ch. LXXVIII. Julius Firmicus Maternus, a convert from Gentilism and a man of quality, and probably always a layman, in the reign of Constantius published a work entitled, Of the Error of Profane Religions. He quotes many books of the Old and New Testament, particularly the gospels and the Revelation, with marks of great respect. A. D. 345.

Ch. LXXIX. Cyril bishop of Jerusalem has a catalogue of the books of the Old and New Testament. In the latter part are the four gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the seven catholic epistles, and the fourteen epistles of Paul, without any express notice taken of the Revelation. A. D. 348.

Ch. LXXX. The Audians, followers of Audius, a pious

and zealous bishop of Syria in Mesopotamia. They are said by Epiphanius to have used, beside the other scriptures, some apocryphal books; but he does not mention their titles. A. D. 350.

Ch. LXXXI. Hilary of Poictiers in Gaul wrote a Commentary upon St. Matthew's gospel and divers books of the Old Testament. He quotes the epistle to the Hebrews as St. Paul's and the Revelation as St. John's. A. D. 354.

Ch. LXXXII. The Aerians were so called from Aerius of Lesser Armenia. They denied the obligation of set fasts and feasts: the keeping of Easter they said was unnecessary; and they argued from scripture in behalf of their peculiar sentiments. These people met with great difficulties, and may induce us to think, that in most times there have been some who opposed growing superstition in the church; but being generally opposed, and with much violence, they could not increase to any great number, and in time were quite reduced. A. D. 360.

Ch. LXXXIII. The Council of Laodicea in one of its canons has a catalogue of the books of the Old and New Testament. That for the Old Testament is much the same with that of the Jews: that for the New Testament has the four gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the seven catholic epistles, and fourteen epistles of the apostle Paul: thus including all the books of the New Testament now received by us, except the book of the Revelation; which perhaps is omitted for no other reason but because it was the design of the council to mention such books only as should be publicly read. A. D. 363.

Ch. LXXXIV. Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis in Cyprus, has three catalogues of the Old, and one of the books of the New Testament, which he rehearseth in this order: the four gospels, fourteen epistles of the apostle Paul, the Acts of the Apostles, seven catholic epistles, and the Revelation, without any other books as of authority: his canon therefore was the same as ours. He supposes St. Mark and St. Luke to have been of the number of Christ's seventy disciples. The Acts of the Apostles he ascribes to St. Luke, as the writer. It appears that the book of the Revelation was not universally received in his time. A. D. 368.

Ch. LXXXV. In this chapter is shown from evidence internal and external, that the Apostolical Constitutions, in eight books, were not composed by the apostles, nor by Clement of Rome, but are a work of the fourth or fifth century. Though this work is an imposture, the writer's testimony to the scriptures ought not to be overlooked; for it

appears that he received our four gospels, the Acts, and the epistles of St. Paul, particularly that to the Hebrews, and the first epistle of St. Peter. He might receive all the catholic epistles, though little notice is here taken of them: but probably he did not receive the book of the Revelation.

At the end of that chapter are remarks upon the Apostolical Canons.

Ch. LXXXVI. Rheticius bishop of Autun, a man of great note in Gaul in the time of the emperor Constantine, published a Commentary upon the Canticles, and some other works not now extant. A. D. 313.

Ch. LXXXVII. Tryphillius, bishop of a city in Cyprus, a man of great repute for eloquence in the reign of Constantius, and well acquainted with the Roman laws, published, besides other works, a Commentary upon the Canticles. He was once blamed for affecting to use a more elegant phrase in quoting Mark ii. 2, in one of his sermons, than that of the original. A. D. 340.

Ch. LXXXVIII. Fortunatianus, born in Africa, bishop of Aquileia in Italy, in the reign of Constantius wrote short Commentaries upon the gospels in a plain style. A. D. 340.

Ch. LXXXIX. Photinus, bishop of Sirmium, disciple of Marcellus of Galatia, and his follower in the principles of Sabellianism and Unitarianism, published divers books against the errors of gentilism and in favour of his own opinions. He died in 375 or 376: he received the scriptures of the Old and New Testament as other christians did.

Ch. XC. Eusebius, born in Sardinia, made bishop of Vercelli in 354, died in 370, or soon after. He translated out of Greek into Latin the Commentary of Eusebius of Cæsarea upon the Psalms.

Ch. XCI. Lucifer, bishop of Cagliari in Sardinia, was author of divers works; which consist very much of passages of the Old and New Testament, cited one after another, with marks of great respect; particularly, he has largely quoted the book of the Acts, the epistle to the Hebrews, the second epistle of St. John, and the epistle of St. Jude; and there is reason to think, that he and his followers received the Revelation: whence it may be argued, that his canon of the New Testament was the same with ours. A. D. 354.

Ch. XCII. Gregory, bishop of Illiberis in the province of Bætica in Spain, was author of several works, of which very little now remains. A. D. 355.

Ch. XCIII. Phœbadius, bishop of Agen in Gaul, pub-

lished a book against the Arians, still extant, and some other small treatises. In that book his respect for the scriptures of the prophets, evangelists, and apostles, is very conspicuous. A. D. 359.

Ch. XCIV. C. Marius Victorinus, an African, an illustrious convert to the christian religion, who for a good while had taught rhetoric at Rome, wrote some books against the Arians, and a Commentary upon the apostle Paul's epistles. In his remaining works most of the books of the New Testament are frequently quoted, particularly the Acts, the epistle to the Hebrews, and the Revelation. A. D. 360.

Ch. XCV. Apollinarius, bishop of Laodicea in Syria, a very learned man, besides his Confutation of Porphyry in thirty books, and other works by which he was very useful to the christians in the time of the emperor Julian, published also many volumes of Commentaries upon the scriptures, monuments of his zeal and affection for them, and of his diligence in studying them.

Ch. XCVI. Damasus, bishop of Rome, had a great regard for Jerom on account of his learning and knowledge of the scriptures. At his desire Jerom corrected the Latin version of the New Testament, then in use. In a letter to Jerom he says, ' There can be no higher entertainment than to confer ' together upon the holy scriptures.' A. D. 366.

Ch. XCVII. Basil, commonly called the Great, bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, besides the gospels and the Acts, has quoted all St. Paul's epistles, particularly that to the Hebrews. He does not much cite the catholic epistles; however, he has several times quoted the first epistle of St. Peter, and the first epistle of St. John. The epistle of St. James is very seldom quoted: the second of St. Peter, the epistle of St. Jude, the first and second of St. John, not at all in any of his genuine works that I remember. Though there is very little notice taken of the book of the Revelation, there is not sufficient reason to say it was rejected by him. See num. ii. vol. iv. For the scriptures of the Old and New Testament he had the greatest regard: he bears witness, that they were read in every assembly of christians for public worship, and he recommends the reading them in private to all sorts of people.

Ch. XCVIII. Gregory Nazianzen. Among his poems is a catalogue of the books of the Old and New Testament. The former is agreeable to that of the Jews: in the latter are expressly mentioned the gospels of the four evangelists, the Acts, fourteen epistles of Paul, seven catholic epistles, without any other. The Revelation is wanting; neverthe-

less it may have been received by him, but not reckoned proper to be publicly read. A. D. 370.

Ch. XCIX. Amphilochius, bishop of Iconium, the chief city of Lycaonia, has an iambic poem, in which is a catalogue of the books of the Old and New Testament. The former is agreeable to the Jewish canon: the books of the New Testament are the four gospels, the Acts of the Apostles written by Luke, then fourteen epistles of the apostle Paul. 'But some say, the epistle to the Hebrews is spu-'rious, not speaking rightly. Then the catholic epistles: 'of which some receive seven, others three only; one of 'James, one of Peter, one of John: whilst others receive 'three of John, and two of Peter, and Jude's the seventh. 'The Revelation of John is approved by some; but many 'say it is spurious. Let this be the most certain canon 'of the divinely-inspired scriptures.' So Amphilochius. A. D. 370.

Ch. C. Gregory, younger brother of St. Basil, bishop of Nyssa in Cappadocia, quotes the gospels, the Acts, which he ascribes to St. Luke, St. Paul's epistles, particularly that to the Hebrews. Concerning the catholic epistles it may be observed, that[p] the first epistle of St. Peter, and the[q] first epistle of St. John, are quoted by him several times: the epistle of St. James may be thought to be quoted in a place, to which I refer[r] below. What respect he had for the other catholic epistles does not clearly appear from his works, so far as I can now recollect. He has quoted the book of the Revelation; though but very seldom. In one of Gregory Nyssen's books against Eunomius are these words, deserving notice: 'Whence,'[s] says he, 'did you 'learn those things, and from whom had you those expres-'sions? They are not in Moses: you did not learn them 'from the prophets, or apostles: the evangelists likewise 'are silent here: we discern them not in any part of scrip-'ture: they must therefore be your own invention.' Certainly this shows, that the scriptures of the Old and New Testament were then esteemed by christians to be the rule of their faith. This passage, now alleged, is additional to

[p] In Cant. Hom. 13. T. i. p. 669. A. Hom. 14. p. 678. A. In diem Nat. Chr. T. iii. p. 348. D. et alibi.

[q] De Vit. Mos. T. i. p. 220. D. In Cant. Hom. 7. T. i. 526. A. Hom. 12. p. 657. De Scop. Christian. T. iii. p. 302, et alibi.

[r] In 1 Cor. xv. 28. Orat. T. i. p. 19. B.

[s] Ποθεν ταυτα μαθων, και παρα τινος τα ῥηματα; Μωϋσης εκ ειπε' προφητων και αποστολων εκ ηκουσεν' ευαγγελιστας τας τοιαυτας φωνας σεσιγηκασιν. Ουδεμιας εστι γραφης ταυτα διδασκουσης μαθειν, κ. λ. Contr. Eunom. Orat. 12. T. ii. p. 794. B.

another to the like purpose formerly quoted from another work of this writer.

Ch. CI. Didymus, master of the catechetical school at Alexandria, wrote Commentaries upon divers books of the Old Testament, and upon the gospels of Matthew and John, and brief notes upon the seven catholic epistles. He received the epistle to the Hebrews, and, probably, the book of the Revelation. A. D. 370.

Ch. CII. Ephrem, called the Syrian, deacon in the church of Edessa, wrote Commentaries in Syriac upon many books of the Old Testament. He has frequently quoted the four gospels, the Acts, and St. Paul's epistles, particularly that to the Hebrews: he has quoted likewise the first epistle of St. Peter, and the first of St. John. Whether he received any of the five catholic epistles, which were sometimes doubted of, does not appear from his Syriac works, which are more to be relied upon than the Greek and Latin translations. Whether he received the book of the Revelation, may be determined by those who are pleased to observe what is said, in loc. vol. iv. His respect for the scriptures is manifest. A. D. 370.

Ch. CIII. Ebedjesu, a learned Syrian writer of the sect of the Nestorians, bishop of Nisibis, called also Soba, in the thirteenth century, flourished about the year 1285. He has a catalogue of the books of the Old and New Testament: that of the New has the four gospels, the Acts written by Luke, three catholic epistles, and fourteen epistles of St. Paul, without any notice of the Revelation. They who are desirous to know more of the canon of the Syrian christians, may do well to observe also the chapter of St. Chrysostom, a native of Antioch, and for a good while presbyter in that church: and the chapter of Severian bishop of Gabala in Syria, and likewise the chapter of Cosmas of Alexandria.

Ch. CIV. Pacian, bishop of Barcelona, has quoted in his remaining works the commonly received books of the New Testament, particularly the Acts of the Apostles, and likewise the book of the Revelation: but I have not observed in him any quotation of the epistle to the Hebrews, nor any plain reference to it. A. D. 370.

Ch. CV. Optatus, a convert from Gentilism, and bishop of Milevi in Africa, beside the gospels has quoted the book of the Acts, and several of St. Paul's epistles, and the first and second epistles of St. John: whether he received the epistle to the Hebrews, is not certain. A. D. 370.

Ch. CVI. Ambrose, bishop of Milan, expressly rejects the gospel according to the twelve, the gospels according

to Basilides, Thomas, and Matthias; and says, that the church has one gospel in four books, spread all over the world, and written by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. He often quotes the Acts, as written by St. Luke: he likewise received all St. Paul's fourteen epistles, and the seven catholic epistles, and the Revelation; consequently his canon of the New Testament was the same as ours: for there appears not in his works any particular regard to the writings of Barnabas, or Clement, or Ignatius, or to the Recognitions, or Constitutions: from whence it may be reasonably concluded, that these writings were not esteemed of authority by himself, or other christians at that time. His respect for the sacred scripture is very manifest: he wrote Commentaries upon divers of the Psalms, and upon St. Luke's gospel: he speaks of it as the practice of the christians in ancient times, as well as in his own, to form their belief by the holy scriptures.

Ch. CVII. The Priscillianists, followers of Priscillian bishop of Abila, prevailed chiefly in Spain: they received all the canonical books of the Old and New Testament, making use likewise of some apocryphal books. Herein they differed from the Manichees, who rejected the scriptures of the Old Testament. It is generally supposed likewise, that some of the Manichees rejected the Acts of the Apostles: if they did, here is another thing in which the Priscillianists differed from the Manichees, whom they are said to have resembled very much; for we know from Augustine, that[t] the Priscillianists received that book. A. D. 378.

Ch. CVIII. Diodorus native of Antioch, and bishop of Tarsus in Cilicia, wrote many books, most of which are now lost. He is said to have written Commentaries upon divers books of the Old Testament, and upon the four gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, and St. John's first epistle. A. D. 378.

Ch. CIX. A Commentary upon thirteen of St. Paul's epistles, by many ascribed to Hilary deacon of Rome. In this work are quoted the four gospels, the Acts of the Apostles written by Luke, the first and second epistle of St. Peter; the first and the third epistle of St. John, and the Revelation. Whether the writer received the epistle to the Hebrews, may be justly questioned, as he did not write any Commentary upon it.

[t] Nec illud moveat, quod Priscillianistæ, Manichæorum simillimi, ad jejunandum die dominico solent testimonium de Apostolorum Actibus, adhibere, cum esset apostolus Paulus in Troade. Sic enim scriptum est, Act. xx. 7. Ad Casulan. Ep. 36. cap. 12. n. 28. T. ii.

Ch. CX. Philaster, bishop of Brescia, author of a work concerning Heresies, received the same books of the New Testament that we do, but we learn from him that there were then some who did not receive the epistle to the Hebrews, nor the Revelation. A. D. 380.

Ch. CXI. Gaudentius, successor of Philaster in the bishopric of Brescia, appears to have had the same canon of scripture as his predecessor. A. D. 387.

Ch. CXII. Sophronius, a learned man, friend of St. Jerom, who translated several of his works into the Greek language, and was himself likewise an author. A. D. 393.

Ch. CXIII. Theodore, native of Antioch, bishop of Mopsuestia in Cilicia, wrote Commentaries upon divers books of the Old Testament, and upon the gospels of St. Matthew, St. Luke, and St. John, and St. Paul's fourteen epistles; which of the catholic epistles were received by him, and whether he received the book of the Revelation, are things not certainly known. There is a fragment of one of his works containing a noble testimony to the four gospels; where he supposeth the first three gospels not to have been written till after St. Paul had openly preached the doctrine of the gospel to the Gentiles, nor till after the other apostles had left Judea to go upon the same service. A. D. 394.

Ch. CXIV. St. Jerom's canon of the Old Testament was that of the Jews; and he received all the books of the New Testament which are now received by us, and no other. However, he lets us know that in his time many Latins did not receive the epistle to the Hebrews as St. Paul's, and that many Greek churches rejected the book of the Revelation. In him are histories of the several writers of the books of the New Testament, and many observations upon the scriptures, with testimonies of high respect for them, and exhortations to read and study them, and, indeed, many other things deserving notice; to which the reader is referred, for they cannot be repeated here.

That chapter concludes with a passage, wherein Jerom triumphs on account of the remarkable progress of the gospel. I here add another passage to the like purpose, from a letter written[u] in 396, in which he says: 'Until[v] the re-

[u] Vid. Pagi ann. 396. n. 3, 4.

[v] Adde, quod ante resurrectionem Christi, notus tantum in Judæâ erat Deus, in Israël magnum nomen ejus. Ubi tunc totius orbis homines, ab Indiâ usque ad Britanniam, a rigidâ septentrionis plagâ usque ad fervores Atlantici Oceani, tam innumerabiles populi, et tantarum gentium multitudines? Quam variæ linguis, habitu tam vestis, et armis: piscium ritu et locustarum, et velut muscæ et culices conterebantur. Absque notitiâ etenim Creatoris sui omnis homo pecus est. Nunc passionem Christi, et resurrectionem ejus cunctarum

'surrection of Christ, "in Judah," only "was God known, 'and his name was great in Israel," Ps. lxxvi. 1. The men 'of all the earth, from India to Britain, and from the cold 'regions of the north to the warm climates of the Atlantic 'Ocean, with the numberless people dwelling in that large 'tract, were no better than beasts, being ignorant of their 'Creator. But now the passion and resurrection of Christ 'are celebrated in the discourses and writings of all nations: 'I need not mention Jews, Greeks, and Latins. The In-'dians, Persians, Goths, and Egyptians, philosophize, and 'firmly believe the immortality of the soul, and future re-'compences; which before, the greatest philosophers had 'denied, or doubted of, or perplexed with their disputes. 'The fierceness of Thracians and Scythians is now softened 'by the gentle sound of the gospel, and everywhere Christ 'is all in all.'

Ch. CXV. Rufinus has a catalogue of the books of the Old and New Testament. His canon of the ancient scriptures likewise is the same as that of the Jews; and his catalogue of the books of the New Testament contains all those which are now received by us, and no other, as of authority. Having recited them, he adds, 'These are the volumes 'which the fathers have included in the canon, and out of 'which they would have us prove the doctrines of our faith.' A. D. 397.

Ch. CXVI. In one of the canons of the third council of Carthage is a catalogue of the books of the Old and New Testament. The latter part of it contains all the books of the New Testament which are now received by us, without any other as sacred and canonical; but the manner in which the epistle to the Hebrews is mentioned, affords reason to think that it was not so generally received in that country as the other thirteen epistles of St. Paul. A. D. 397.

Ch. CXVII. In Augustine likewise is a catalogue of the books of the Old and New Testament, and his canon is the same as ours; however, sometimes he quotes the epistle to the Hebrews, as if he was not fully satisfied that it was St.

gentium et voces et literæ sonant. Taceo de Hebræis, Græcis, et Latinis: quas nationes fidei suæ in crucis titulo Dominus dedicavit. Immortalem animam, et post dissolutionem corporis subsistentem, quod Pythagoras somniavit, Democritus non credidit, in consolationem damnationis suæ Socrates disputavit in carcere, Indus, Persa, Gottus, Ægyptius, philosophantur. Bessorum feritas, et pellitorum turba populorum, qui mortuorum quondam inferiis homines immolabant, stridorem suum in dulce crucis fregerunt melos, et totius mundi una vox Christus est. Ep. 35. al. 3. ad Heliodor. Epitaph. Nepotian. T. i. p. 267, 268.

Paul's. We perceive from him, that with some Latins it was of doubtful authority, whilst it was readily received by the churches in the east, whose opinion he was inclined to follow. We can perceive from him also, that the book of the Revelation was not universally received in his time. He strongly asserts in almost innumerable places, the high authority of the canonical scriptures of the Old and New Testament above all the determinations of bishops and councils. We are assured by him, that the scriptures were read in all the assemblies of christians. He has many just observations concerning the genuineness and authority of the books of the New Testament, the credibility of the evangelical history, the truth of the christian religion, and its wonderful progress. A. D. 395.

At num. xv. 7. is an account of a conjecture of Dr. Bentley, for amending a suspected passage in Augustine, with remarks. Since the publication of that volume, I have had the honour to receive from the bishop of Oxford another conjecture: 'For "Itala," his lordship would read "usitata:" so Augustine himself elsewhere[w] calls the old 'Latin version, and also [x]vulgata, as does [y]Jerom. The 'first syllable, "us," might easily be swallowed up by the 'end of the word immediately preceding, which is "interpretationibus;" and the remaining difference is only that 'between a *t* and an *l;* and thus there is no need of 'changing "nam" into "quæ;" which, having no manuscript to favour it, may be reckoned a somewhat bold 'alteration.' If this conjecture be approved of, some observations of mine in loc. are superseded, as I am very willing they should be for the sake of better.

Ch. CXVIII. The books of the New Testament received by St. Chrysostom are the four gospels, the Acts of the Apostles written by St. Luke, St. Paul's fourteen epistles, the epistle of St. James, one epistle of St. Peter, and one epistle of St. John, without any the least appearance of an especial respect for any christian writings after the times of the apostles. For the scriptures of the Old and New Tes-

[w] Non autem ita se habet, vel quod Johannes interponit, vel codices ecclesiastici interpretationis usitatæ. Aug. de Consens. Evang. cap. 66. T. iii. P. ii. edit. Bened.

[x] Fiunt itaque anni a diluvio usque ad Abraham, mille septuaginta duo, secundum vulgatam editionem, hoc est, interpretum Septuaginta. De Civ. Dei, l. xvi. cap. 10. Tom. vii.

[y] Legi in nonnullis codicibus, et studiosus lector forte reperiet id ipsum in eo loco, ubi nos possumus, et vulgata habet editio: 'ut impleretur quod dictum 'est per prophetam dicentem,' ibi scriptum, per Isaïam prophetam dicentem. Hier. in Matt. cap. xiii. 35. T. iv. P. i. p. 58. ed. Bened.

tament he has the greatest regard: they were read in the public assemblies of christian worship; and he recommends the reading them to all in private, as likely to answer the most valuable ends and purposes. In his works are many agreeable observations concerning the credibility of the evangelical history, and the swift and wonderful progress of the gospel. A. D. 398.

I add here only one testimony of respect for the scriptures: 'You[z] see,' says he, 'into how great absurdity they 'fall who will not follow the rule of the divine scripture, 'but trust entirely to their own reasonings.'

Ch. CXIX. Severian, bishop of Gabala in Syria, received the four gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, fourteen epistles of the apostle Paul, and three of the catholic epistles; and for the scriptures of the Old and the New Testament he shows the highest regard. A. D. 401.

Ch. CXX. Sulpicius Severus, of Aquitain in Gaul, an enemy to all persecution, quotes the four gospels, the Acts written by Luke, and other books of the New Testament, particularly the epistle of St. James, and the Revelation, which he ascribes to the apostle John; but, he says, it was either foolishly or wickedly rejected by many. His general divisions of the books of scripture are such as these: 'the 'law, the prophets, the gospels and apostles; the law and 'the apostles; the Old and New Testament.' A. D. 401.

Ch. CXXI. Chromatius, bishop of Aquileia, a learned man, and a patron of learning, wrote but little. In what remains of him we see quoted most of the generally received books of the New Testament, in particular the Acts of the Apostles, the epistle to the Hebrews, and the Revelation. He has also expressly quoted the epistle of James, the first epistle of Peter, and the first epistle of John; and probably he received the rest of the catholic epistles. He compares the scripture to a lamp: he says, 'it ought not to be hid, but 'set up in the church, that thereby all may be enlightened, 'and guided in the way of salvation.' A. D. 401.

Ch. CXXII. Victor of Antioch wrote a Commentary upon St. Mark's gospel, collected out of the works of Origen and other ancient writers. He supposes Mark to be son of Mary, mentioned Acts xii. For a while he accompanied his uncle Barnabas, and Paul. When he came to Rome, he joined Peter, and followed him: for which reason he is particularly mentioned by that apostle, 1 Ep. v.

[z] Ὁρας εις ὁσην ατοπιαν εκπιπτουσιν οἱ μη βουλομενοι τῳ της θειας γραφης κατακολουθειν κανονι, αλλα τοις οικειοις λογισμοις επιτρεποντες. In Gen. cap. 33. Hom. 58. T. iv. p. 566. B.

13. His gospel, he says, was written at Rome, at the request of the believers there. At the beginning of his work he says, that many had written Commentaries upon the gospels of Matthew and John, a few only upon Luke's, none at all upon Mark's; which determined him to attempt it. Thus he bears testimony to the four gospels. He has also quotations of the Acts, several of St. Paul's epistles, particularly that to the Hebrews, the epistle of James, and the first of Peter. A. D. 401.

Ch. CXXIII. Innocent bishop of Rome has a catalogue of the books of the Old and New Testament, which were in the canon, and is exactly the same as ours. A. D. 402.

Ch. CXXIV. Paulinus was bishop of Nola in Italy. His works abound with quotations or allusions to texts of scripture. He says, John wrote the last of the four evangelists; and he extols the beginning of his gospel as confuting all heretics: he celebrates St. Luke as a physician for soul and body, and ascribes to him two books, unquestionably meaning his gospel, and the Acts. He has quoted all St. Paul's epistles, particularly that to the Hebrews: he likewise frequently quotes the epistle of St. James, the first of St. Peter, the first of St. John, and the Revelation. A. D. 403.

Ch. CXXV. Pelagius wrote a Commentary upon all St. Paul's epistles, excepting that to the Hebrews: he quotes also the Acts, the epistle of James, both the epistles of Peter, and the Revelation. He expresses the greatest regard for the authority of the scriptures, and recommends the reading them to all. A. D. 405.

Ch. CXXVI. Prudentius, an elegant Latin poet of an honourable family in Spain, refers to the gospels, the Acts, and other books of the New Testament, particularly the Revelation of John the apostle and evangelist. A. D. 405.

Ch. CXXVII. Palladius, friend of Chrysostom, and author of a dialogue concerning his life, freely quotes the gospels, the Acts, and St. Paul's epistles. He seems to have received all the catholic epistles; but whether he received the Revelation does not appear. A. D. 408.

Ch. CXXVIII. Nonnus, of Panopolis in Egypt, wrote in Greek verse a paraphrase of St. John's gospel, still extant. A. D. 410.

Ch. CXXIX. Isidorus, of Pelusium in Egypt, a man of good judgment, and exemplary virtue, and a polite and agreeable writer, often quotes with great respect the four gospels, the book of the Acts, which he ascribes to St. Luke, all St. Paul's epistles, divers of the catholic epistles; and seems to have had the same canon of the New Testament

with us. He justifies the plain and familiar style of the scriptures, as most conducive to the edification and salvation of men of all conditions. A. D. 412.

Ch. CXXX. Cyril, bishop of Alexandria, his native city, received all the books of the New Testament which we do, and no other as of authority. He commends all the evangelists: but speaks of John as superior to the rest. He recommends the studying of the scriptures, and says, 'that 'from the holy prophets, apostles, and evangelists, we may 'learn how to attain to piety, and secure to ourselves true 'peace of mind.' A. D. 412.

Ch. CXXXI. Theodoret, native of Antioch, bishop of Cyrus in Syria, a man of extensive learning, and a fine writer, author of Commentaries upon most of the books of the Old Testament, and divers other works, received the four gospels, the Acts, which he ascribes to St. Luke, St. Paul's fourteen epistles, upon which he wrote Commentaries; the epistle of James, the first of Peter, and the first of John; but there is no clear proof that he received the other catholic epistles, or the Revelation; insomuch that there is reason to think that his canon of the New Testament was that of the Syrian christians. He has digested St. Paul's epistles according to the order of time in which they were written. The general titles and divisions of scripture used by him are these: 'gospels, prophets, and 'apostles; the books of the sacred gospels, the writings of 'the holy apostles, and the oracles of the thrice blessed 'prophets; evangelists and apostles, the prophets, and 'Moses the chief of the prophets.' He recommends the reading and studying them; and shows the benefit of so doing. This learned author vindicates the popular style of the scriptures, and admirably represents, and expatiates upon, the swift progress and wonderful success of the gospel, in converting men in great numbers, in almost every part of the world, from idolatry and vice; which had been effected, not by arms and legions of soldiers, but by the preaching of Christ's apostles, destitute of worldly supports, and undergoing many difficulties and discouragements. A. D. 423.

Ch. CXXXII. John Cassian quotes not only the four gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, and other books of the New Testament universally received by catholic christians; but likewise the epistle to the Hebrews as Paul's, the epistle of James, the second of Peter, the epistle of Jude, and the Revelation: whence we may conclude, that he received all the books of the New Testament which we receive;

which is worthy of observation. Cassian, who had been in Egypt and Palestine, and at Constantinople, as well as in the western part of the Roman empire, did not follow the peculiar opinion of any of those places, but received all those books of the New Testament which appeared to have been received upon good ground by christians. These he quotes as of authority, and with tokens of great respect. A. D. 424.

Ch. CXXXIII. Eutherius was bishop of Tyana, in Cappadocia. In the little that remains of him the books of the New Testament are often quoted, particularly the beginning of St. John's gospel, the Acts, and the epistle to the Hebrews, as St. Paul's. He has two remarkable arguments or discourses; one against such as judged of principles by the multitude of those who embraced them; the other against some who discouraged the reading the scriptures. A. D. 431.

Ch. CXXXIV. Prosper of Aquitain, by some said to have been a bishop, by others reckoned more probably a layman, quotes not only the gospels, and the Acts, and other books of the New Testament universally received; but likewise the epistle to the Hebrews, the epistle of James, the second of Peter, and the Revelation. He expressly rejects the book of Hermas as of no authority. A. D. 434.

Ch. CXXXV. Works ascribed to Prosper. All the books of the New Testament seem to have been received by the authors of these several works. In one of them, entitled, Of the Calling of the Gentiles, the epistles of St. Peter are quoted as written to Gentile christians; and in another, entitled, Of the Divine Promises and Predictions, written by an African, the second epistle of the same apostle is quoted as written to Gentiles. A. D. 434.

Ch. CXXXVI. Vincentius Lirinensis, or Vincent, monk and presbyter of the monastery of Lerins, an island on the south coast of France, wrote a Memoir or Commonitorium for the catholic faith, against the novelties of all heretics. He says, that he who would avoid the errors of heretics and be preserved in the right faith 'should secure himself 'by this twofold method; first, by the authority of the di-'vine law, and then by the tradition of the catholic church;' upon which doctrine divers remarks have been made by us: and it appears from himself to have been a general opinion, that 'the scripture is perfect, and abundantly sufficient,' for all the purposes of a rule. He seems to have received all the books of the New Testament that we do, except the epistle to the Hebrews, which may be questioned. He lets

us know, that heretics received the same scriptures with the catholics; and that they quoted them much in their discourses and writings, even 'the law, the prophets, the gos-'pels, and the apostles.' A. D. 434.

Ch. CXXXVII. Eucherius, bishop of Lyons in Gaul. It appears from the quotations of scripture in his remaining works, that he received all the books of the New Testament which are now received by us. A. D. 434.

Ch. CXXXVIII. Cæcilius Sedulius, presbyter, a man of great ingenuity, published two works, one in verse, the other in prose, both having the same design; and each exhibiting, in the former part, the most remarkable things of the Old Testament, and in the latter the history of our Saviour, taken from the four gospels. A. D. 434.

Ch. CXXXIX. In a later age, another Sedulius, of Ireland as it seems, a man well skilled in the Greek language, published in Latin a Commentary upon St. Paul's fourteen epistles, collected out of Origen, Jerom, and other ancient writers. That Commentary affords many useful observations, divers of which have been selected by us. The author received all the books of the New Testament, the Revelation in particular. A. D. 818.

Ch. CXL. Leo, bishop of Rome, received all the books of the New Testament which are now received by us. He says, 'This is the cause of errors and heresies, that men 'follow their own fancies, and attend not as they ought to 'the doctrine of the prophets, apostles, and evangelists.' Again: 'The Holy Ghost instructs us in the law, the pro-'phets, the gospels, and the apostles.' Once more: 'What 'reason can there be, why we should receive what is not 'taught by the law or the prophets, the evangelists or 'apostles?' Here we see it was then the prevailing sentiment of christians in general, that the scriptures of the Old and New Testament are the only rule of faith. For other things I refer to the chapter itself. A. D. 440.

Ch. CXLI. Salvian, presbyter of Marseilles, a very agreeable writer, seems to have received all the books of the New Testament; for beside the gospels and the book of the Acts, often and largely quoted by him, he quotes the epistle to the Hebrews, the epistle of James, the second of Peter, and the Revelation. His general divisions of the sacred scriptures are such as these: 'First the law, then 'the prophets, thirdly the gospel, fourthly the apostles; 'the Old and New Testament; the prophets, the apostles, 'the gospels:' and the like: and he bears witness, that they who were called heretics received the same scriptures

that other christians did, the same prophets, the same apostles and evangelists. A. D. 440.

Ch. CXLII. Euthalius, at first deacon at Alexandria, afterwards bishop of Sulca in Egypt, published an edition of St. Paul's epistles, and afterwards an edition of the Acts of the Apostles, and the seven catholic epistles, having first compared them with the exact copies in the library of Cæsarea in Palestine. All the books of the New Testament were at first written by the apostles and evangelists in one continued tenor, without any sections or chapters. In the year 396, some learned christian, whose name is not known, divided St. Paul's epistles into chapters or lessons: these Euthalius made use of in his own edition of the same epistles, adding some other lesser sections or subdivisions. This he is supposed to have done about the year 458. Afterwards, in the year 490, he published an edition of the Acts of the Apostles, and the seven catholic epistles; now dividing these also into lessons, chapters, and verses, which had never been done before; and to the several parts of this work he prefixed a prologue. As Euthalius confined his labours to those parts of the New Testament, it may be argued that the Revelation was not publicly read in the churches at Alexandria; though it might be received as sacred scripture. There are divers other things observable in that chapter, but they cannot be repeated here.

Ch. CXLIII. Dionysius, falsely called the Areopagite, author of divers works, has a catalogue of the books of the Old and New Testament, very agreeable to what is the present canon. He received the Revelation: and it is probable, that he thought St. John's gospel to be the last written book of the New Testament; it being mentioned last, and next after the Revelation. A. D. 490.

Ch. CXLIV. Gennadius presbyter of Marseilles, beside the other scriptures, received the Revelation as a writing of John the apostle and evangelist. A. D. 494.

Ch. CXLV. Gelasius bishop of Rome has a catalogue of the books of the Old and New Testament; that of the New is exactly the same as ours. Having recited these catalogues, it is added, 'that upon the prophetical, evangelical, 'and apostolical scriptures, the catholic church is built by 'the grace of God.' Afterwards follows an enumeration of many ecclesiastical writings, which are allowed to be read as conducive to edification; and then a long catalogue of apocryphal books, which are rejected. All which is of use to show, that the books now received by us as canonical, are of a superior character to all others; and that none beside

them ever were esteemed to be of authority, or decisive in things of religion. A. D. 540.

Ch. CXLVI. Andrew bishop of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia, wrote a Commentary upon the Revelation. He plainly received all the books of the New Testament which are now received by us. A. D. 500.

Ch. CXLVII. In this chapter is an account of the Alexandrian manuscript, and divers stichometries.

The Alexandrian manuscript, written as is supposed before the end of the fifth century, consists of four volumes in folio, or large quarto: three of which contain the scriptures of the Old Testament in the Greek version of the Seventy, and the fourth, the scriptures of the New Testament, but not quite complete. For more particulars I must refer to the chapter itself.

Afterwards follows the Stichometry of Nicephorus, patriarch of Constantinople. A. D. 806. A stichometry is a catalogue of books of scripture, to which is added the number of verses in each book. In the stichometry of Nicephorus is a catalogue of the books of the Old Testament, very agreeable to the Jewish canon; and then a catalogue of the books of the New Testament, exactly the same with our present canon, except that the Revelation is wanting, at least in some copies. Afterwards follow catalogues of contradicted and apocryphal books: which afford evidence, that there never were any christian writings, which were esteemed to be of authority, beside those which are now reckoned by us sacred and canonical. The same observation is confirmed by the stichometries from Cotelerius, which are subjoined in the same chapter.

Ch. CXLVIII. Cosmas of Alexandria, called Indicopleustes on account of a voyage which he made to the Indies, was at first a merchant, afterwards monk, and author. Matthew, he says, is the first evangelist; and he supposeth him to have written his gospel in Judea soon after the martyrdom of St. Stephen: Mark, the second evangelist, wrote his gospel at Rome, by the direction of Peter: Luke is the third evangelist, who likewise wrote the Acts: John, the fourth and chief of the evangelists, as he is here called, wrote his gospel at Ephesus after that the faithful writings of the other evangelists had been brought to him. The books of the New Testament received by Cosmas, are the four gospels, the Acts, St. Paul's fourteen epistles, and three of the catholic epistles, as it seems, that of James, the first of Peter, and the first of John, agreeably to the sentiment of the Syrian christians. And he says, 'that no perfect or well

'instructed christian should endeavour to prove any thing 'but by the canonical books of scripture acknowledged by 'all: which books have sufficiently declared what is need-'ful to be known concerning the doctrines of religion.' A. D. 535.

Ch. CXLIX. Facundus, a learned African bishop, appears to have received all the books of the New Testament which we receive, and no other. His general division of the scriptures of the New Testament is that of 'gospels and apostles:' for which he has the greatest regard. A. D. 540.

Ch. CL. Arethas, generally supposed to have been bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, wrote a Commentary upon the book of the Revelation, extracted out of the Commentary of his predecessor Andrew, and the works of Irenæus, Hippolytus, Gregory Nazianzen, Cyril of Alexandria, and others. It appears by his quotations, that he received the same books of the New Testament that we do. A. D. 550.

Ch. CLI. Arator, sub-deacon in the church of Rome, published a work, entitled the Apostolical History, in verse, in two books, composed out of the Acts of the Apostles, which he ascribes to St. Luke. A. D. 544.

Ch. CLII. Junilius was an African bishop, but of what place is uncertain. He is very particular in his manner of dividing the books of scripture, 'Some,' he says, 'are of 'perfect, others of middle authority, others of none at all; 'and some are historical, some prophetical, some proverbial, 'and some teach simply. The historical books of the New 'Testament, of perfect and canonical authority, are the four 'gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, and the Acts 'of the Apostles: the books that teach simply, or plainly, 'are the epistles of the apostle Paul to the Romans, the 'Corinthians, the Galatians, the Ephesians, the Philip-'pians, the Colossians, the Thessalonians, to Timothy, Titus, 'Philemon, the Hebrews, one of the blessed Peter to the 'Gentiles, and the first epistle of the blessed John. To 'these many add five more, one epistle of James, a 'second of Peter, one of Jude, and two of John.' He likewise says, that the Revelation of John was doubted of generally by the christians in the east, which may imply, that it was generally received in Africa, as indeed it was. The books last mentioned, which were not received by all, seemed to be reckoned by him of 'middle authority' only; the rest were of perfect and canonical authority. And it is observable, that he says St. Peter's first epistle was written to Gentiles; it will follow that the second also was written

to Gentiles; for very probably they were both written to the same people. A. D. 550.

Ch. CLIII. M. A. Cassiodorius in his Institutions has three catalogues of the Old and New Testament; one called by him Jerom's, the second Augustine's, the third that of the ancient translation: and it is very observable, that in none of these catalogues mention is made of any books of the New Testament as canonical which are not received as such by us. There are not inserted in any of these catalogues Barnabas, or Clement, or Ignatius, or any other christian writers whatever; which affords a cogent argument, that there never were any other christian writings, which were placed by the churches upon a level with those now received by us as canonical. A. D. 556.

Cassiodorius published likewise a work called Complexions, or Short Commentaries upon the epistles, the Acts of the Apostles, and the Revelation; they are upon St. Paul's fourteen epistles, the seven catholic epistles, the Acts, and the Revelation: by which it is manifest, that he received all the books of the New Testament which are now received by us, and no other.

Ch. CLIV. The author of the imperfect work upon St. Matthew was a bishop and an Arian, who wrote in Latin in the sixth century. From his quotations it appears, that he received all the books of the New Testament that we do. He has likewise quoted divers apocryphal books; but, as it seems, not as books of authority. He has some remarkable passages concerning the time and occasion of writing the gospels of St. Matthew and St. John.

Ch. CLV. Victor Tununensis an African bishop, who wrote a Chronicle ending at the year 566, says, 'that when 'Messala was consul, that is, in the year of Christ 506, at 'Constantinople, by order of the emperor Anastasius, the 'holy gospels, being written by illiterate evangelists, were 'censured and corrected.'

Some have hence argued, that the copies of the New Testament, of the gospels at least, have not come down to us pure and uncorrupted, as they were originally written, but were altered at the time above mentioned.

In answer to which it has been observed by us, agreeably to what had been already said by divers learned men, first, that it was impossible in the sixth century to effect an alteration in the sense or words of the gospels, or any other books of the New Testament; forasmuch as there were at that time in every part of the known world, in Europe, Asia,

and Africa, numerous copies of the books of the New Testament, in the original Greek, and in the Syriac, Latin, and other languages, into which they had been translated. Secondly, that no alteration was made in the gospels or other sacred books is hence apparent; that our present copies agree with the quotations of ancient Greek and Latin authors, and with the translations made before the time of Anastasius. Thirdly, the story of Victor deserves no regard, because he is singular. No other writer has mentioned it beside Isidore of Seville, who transcribed him; whereas, if such an attempt had been made by Anastasius, and any books had been published with alterations, it would have made a great noise in the world, and would have occasioned a general outcry. The emperor Anastasius was far from being popular in his government. There are extant writings of contemporaries, as well as of others, in which he is freely and grievously reproached; nevertheless there is no notice taken of this affair, which would have given greater and more general offence to christians than any other.

Ch. CLVI. Gregory the first, bishop of Rome, received all the books of the New Testament, as of authority, which we do, and no other. Some in his time doubted of the genuineness of the second epistle of St. Peter; but he shows their doubts to be unreasonable. His general titles and divisions of the sacred scriptures are these: 'The Old 'and New Testament, consisting of the law and the pro- 'phets, the gospels and Acts, and words of apostles; the law 'and the prophets, gospel and apostles.' He says, 'Whoever 'was writer of the scriptures, the Holy Ghost was the au- 'thor.' And, 'the doctrine of the scripture surpasseth be- 'yond comparison all other learning and instruction what- 'ever. In the scriptures,' he says, 'there are obscure and 'difficult things to exercise the more knowing, plain things 'to nourish weak minds;' and he assures his hearers, that 'the more the scriptures are read and meditated upon, the 'more easy and delightful they will be.' A. D. 590.

Ch. CLVII. Isidore, bishop of Seville in Spain, has several catalogues of the books of the Old and New Testament. He says, that Matthew wrote his gospel the first, in Judea; then Mark in Italy; Luke the third evangelist, in Achaia; and John the last, in Ephesus. The first and last relate what they had heard Christ speak, or seen him perform; the other two, placed between them, relate what they had heard from apostles: the Acts of the Apostles contain the

history of the infancy of the church; the writer is the evangelist Luke; which, he says, is well known. Divers other things deserving notice may be seen in his chapter. A. D. 596.

Ch. CLVIII. Leontius, who for some time was an advocate at Constantinople, afterwards retired and lived a monk in Palestine. He has a catalogue of the scriptures, wherein the books of the Old and New Testament are recited distinctly and agreeably. His catalogue of the books of the Old Testament is much the same with that of the Jews: his catalogue of the books of the New Testament contains all which are now received by us, and no other. Here is no notice taken of the Constitutions, or Recognitions, or Clementines, or any other christian writings as of authority. The scriptures of the New Testament are divided by him into six books: the first book contains Matthew and Mark; the second Luke and John; the third is the Acts of the Apostles; the fourth the catholic epistles, being seven in number; the fifth book is the fourteen epistles of the apostle Paul; the sixth is the Revelation of John. 'These,' says he, 'are the ancient and the new books, which are received in the church as canonical.' And soon after he says, 'the period next after Christ's ascension, is treated of in the 'Acts of the Apostles. The following period reaches from 'the death of the apostles to the reign of Constantine; the 'affairs of which have been related by several ecclesiastical 'historians, as Eusebius and Theodoret, whom we are not 'obliged to receive: for beside the Acts of the Apostles, 'no such writings are appointed to be received by us.' A. D. 610.

Ch. CLIX. Venerable Bede, beside many other works, wrote Commentaries upon all the books of the New Testament now received. His prologue to the seven catholic epistles may be seen at large in his chapter. A. D. 701.

Ch. CLX. John Damascenus, monk and presbyter, though a native of Damascus, wrote in Greek, and is supposed to represent the sentiment of the Greek christians of his time. He has catalogues of the Old and New Testament, which are recited by us in his chapter, with remarks. His general titles and divisions of the books of scripture, and his respect for them, appear in such expressions as these: 'All 'things which are delivered to us by the law and the pro-'phets, the apostles and evangelists, we receive, acknow-'ledge, and venerate, seeking not any thing beyond what 'has been taught by them.' Again: 'We cannot think, or

'say any thing of God, besides what is divinely taught and 'revealed to us by the divine oracles of the Old and New 'Testament.' A. D. 730.

Ch. CLXI. Photius, patriarch of Constantinople, received the same scriptures of the Old and New Testament which are now generally received by us. Beside other works he wrote Commentaries upon the Psalms, the prophets, and St. Paul's epistles. This great critic, and fine writer, was a great admirer of the apostle Paul, and has celebrated his manly and unaffected eloquence.

Ch. CLXII. Œcumenius, bishop of Tricca in Thessaly, received the same books of the New Testament that we do. He wrote Commentaries upon the Acts, St. Paul's fourteen epistles, and the seven catholic epistles. Upon Acts xiii. 13, he says, 'this John, who is also called Mark, nephew 'to Barnabas, wrote the gospel according to him, and was 'also disciple of Peter, of whom he says in his epistle, '"Mark, my son, saluteth you."' And upon Acts xv. 13, he says, 'this James, appointed bishop of Jerusalem by the 'Lord, was son of Joseph, [meaning by a former wife,] and 'brother of our Lord Jesus Christ, according to the flesh.' For other things the reader is referred to the chapter itself. A. D. 950.

Ch. CLXIII. Theophylact, archbishop of the chief city in Bulgaria, received all the books of the New Testament that we do, excepting the book of the Revelation; concerning which his judgment does not now appear to us. He wrote Commentaries upon the four gospels, the Acts, and St. Paul's fourteen epistles. He says, 'There are four 'evangelists, two of whom, Matthew and John, were apos-'tles of Christ; the other two, Mark and Luke, were of the 'number of Christ's seventy disciples: Mark was a com-'panion and disciple of Peter, Luke of Paul. Matthew 'first wrote a gospel in the Hebrew language, for the use 'of the Hebrew believers, eight years after Christ's ascen-'sion; Mark wrote ten years after our Lord's ascension, 'having been instructed by Peter; Luke fifteen, and John 'two and thirty years after our Saviour's ascension.' Afterwards, 'Mark wrote at Rome, ten years after Christ's 'ascension, at the request of the believers there, being the 'disciple of Peter, whom he calls his son spiritually: his 'name was John; he was nephew to Barnabas, and for a 'while was also companion of Paul.' He likewise says, that Mark's gospel was said to be Peter's: he says, that Luke, who wrote the gospel and the Acts, was a native of Antioch, and by profession a physician. In his preface to

St. Matthew's gospel he writes to this purpose: 'And was 'not one evangelist sufficient? Yes. Nevertheless, for 'making the truth more manifest, four were permitted to 'write: for when you see these four, not conferring toge- 'ther, nor meeting in the same place, but separate from each 'other, writing the same things as with one mouth, are you 'not led to admire the truth of the gospel, and to say, that 'they spake by the Holy Ghost? Do not say to me, that 'they do not agree in every thing.—For they agree in the 'necessary and principal things; and if they agree in such 'things, why should you wonder that they vary in lesser 'matters? They are the more credible for not agreeing in 'all things; for then it would have been thought, that they 'had met and consulted together: but now one has written 'what another has omitted; and therefore they seem to dif- 'fer in some things.' A. D. 1070.

Ch. CLXIV. Euthymius, a monk at Constantinople, besides other works, wrote Commentaries upon the Psalms, and the four gospels; collected chiefly out of Chrysostom, and other ancient writers. According to him Matthew wrote eight, Mark ten, Luke fifteen years after Christ's ascension; but the evangelist John did not write his gospel till many years after the destruction of Jerusalem.

Here ends this part of my design; for my intention was to write at large the history of all, or almost all, the christian writers of the first four centuries, with their testimony to the books of the New Testament: forasmuch as it is universally allowed, that witnesses near the time of any events are the most credible and material: that has filled ten volumes. Afterward I intended to write briefly, the history of the principal writers, from the end of the fourth century, as low as Theophylact and Euthymius, to the end of the eleventh, or the beginning of the twelfth century, with their testimony likewise to the scriptures of the New Testament; which has been performed in the eleventh volume alone of the former edition.

Ch. CLXV. The chapter of Nicephorus Callisti, who lived not before the fourteenth century, more than two hundred years after the writers last mentioned, (without taking notice of any of the authors in that space) was added only by way of conclusion, as containing the sum of our argument, and of what was to be proved by us. For that learned monk, in his Ecclesiastical History, referring to what had been said by Eusebius concerning the books of the New Testament, and having mentioned those which had been all along universally acknowledged, and then the epistle to the

Hebrews, and those of the catholic epistles, which had been doubted of by some, and the Revelation, adds, 'But though 'there were for a while doubts about these, we know that 'at length they have been received by all the churches 'under heaven with a firm assent.' And he says, that all others were rejected from being part of sacred scripture. By which we are assured, that all the books of the New Testament which are now received by us were generally received in those times; and that there were not then, nor ever had been, any books of authority among christians beside them.

And now I hope that there needs not any long harangue to show the force of our argument. In the first part of this work it was shown, that there is not any thing in the books of the New Testament, however strictly canvassed, inconsistent with their supposed time and authors; which alone (as was formerly shown at large) affords good reason to believe, that they were written by persons who lived before the destruction of Jerusalem, which happened in the seventieth year of our Lord's nativity, according to the common computation.

In this second part we have had express and positive evidence, that these books were written by those whose names they bear, even the apostles of Jesus Christ, who was crucified at Jerusalem in the reign of Tiberius Cæsar, when Pontius Pilate was governor in Judea, and their well known companions and fellow-labourers. It is the concurring testimony of early and later ages, and of writers of all countries in the several parts of the known world, Europe, Asia, and Africa, and of men of different sentiments in divers respects; for we have had before us the testimony of those called heretics, especially in the third and fourth centuries, as well as catholics. These books were received from the beginning with the greatest respect, and have been publicly and solemnly read in the assemblies of christians throughout the world in every age from that time to this. They were early translated into the languages of divers countries and people: they were quoted by way of proof in all arguments of a religious nature, and were appealed to on both sides in all points of controversy that arose among christians themselves; they were likewise recommended to the perusal of others as containing the authentic account of the christian doctrine; and many commentaries have been written upon them, to explain and illustrate them; all which affords full assurance of their genuineness and integrity. If these books had not been written by those to whom they

are ascribed, and if the things related in them had not been true, they could not have been received from the beginning: if they contain a true account of things, the christian religion is from God, and cannot but be embraced by serious and attentive men, who impartially examine, and are willing to be determined by evidence.

Much has been said by some in late times about spurious and apocryphal books, composed in the early days of christianity. I hope, that all objections of that sort have been answered or obviated in[a] the preceding volumes; nevertheless, I shall put together some observations, concerning them, in this conclusion.

1. Those books were not so much used by the primitive christians.

There are no quotations of any of them in the apostolical fathers; by whom I mean Barnabas, Clement of Rome, Hermas, Ignatius, and Polycarp; whose writings reach from about the year of our Lord 70, to the year 108. I say this confidently, because I think it has been[b] proved.

Irenæus quotes not any of these books: he[c] mentions some of them, but he never quotes them. The same may be said of Tertullian: he has mentioned[d] a book, called 'Acts of Paul and Thecla,' but it is only to condemn it. Clement of Alexandria[e] and Origen[f] have mentioned and quoted several such books; but never as of authority, and sometimes with express marks of dislike, as may be seen at large in their chapters. Eusebius quotes no such books in any of his works. He has mentioned them indeed; but how? Not by way of approbation; but to show, that they were of little or no value, and that they never were received by the sounder part of christians. Athanasius[g] mentions not any of them by name; he only passeth a severe censure upon them in general: nor do these books ever come in the way of Jerom but he shows signs of his displeasure. I may not allow myself to go any lower; nor can it be expected.

I only farther add here, that these books were always obscure, and little known. That[h] the gospel according to the Egyptians was very obscure, appears from Clement's manner of quoting it; and we saw manifest proof of the

[a] See particularly, beside other places, the history of the Manichees, vol. iii. p. 430—436. and the chapter of Eusebius of Cæsarea, vol. iv. p. 128—132.

[b] See here, p. 188. and vol. ii. p. 53, 54, 56, 91, 92.

[c] Vid. Iren. lib. i. cap. 31. [al. 35.] lib. iii. cap. 11. p. 192.

[d] See vol. ii. p. 305.

[e] Ibid. p. 250—258.

[f] Ch. xxxviii. num. xxiv.

[g] See here, p. 219. and vol. iv. p. 155.

[h] Vol. ii. p. 250.

obscurity of the gospel of Peter in[i] Serapion's censure of it. Eusebius, having given an account of the two epistles of St. Peter, proceeds, 'But[k] the book entitled his Acts, 'and that called the Gospel according to him, and that styled 'his Preaching, and the Revelation under his name, we 'know that they have not been delivered down to us in the 'number of catholic writings, forasmuch as no ecclesiasti-'cal writer of the ancients, or of our time, has made use of 'testimonies out of them.' In another place he says, 'He[l] 'had given a catalogue of such books of scripture as, ac-'cording to the ecclesiastical tradition, are true, genuine, 'and universally acknowledged, and of others that are con-'troverted, and yet appear to have been known to many; 'that by this means we may know these from such as have 'been published by heretics under the names of apostles, 'as containing the gospels of Peter, and Thomas, and Mat-'thias, and some others; and the Acts of Andrew and John, 'and other apostles: which books none of the ecclesiastical 'writers in the succession of the apostles have vouchsafed 'to mention.' Our author's expressions are very strong: but we may hence conclude, that little notice had been taken of these books by ancient writers.

2. These books do not overthrow the evangelical history, but confirm it.

As formerly[m] said, 'These apocryphal books confirm the 'history of the genuine and authentic scriptures of the 'New Testament. They are written in the names of such, 'as our authentic scriptures say were apostles, or com-'panions of apostles. They all suppose the dignity of our 'Lord's person, and a power of working miracles, together 'with a high degree of authority, to have been conveyed 'by him to his apostles.'

Every one who observes that these books are called Gospels, or Preachings of Peter, Paul, Thomas, Matthias, Bartholomew, or Acts of Paul, Andrew, John, and other apostles, must suppose that the composers did not intend to disparage them, whatever they might do in the event. No, they had great respect for them, and knew that other christians had the like: therefore by recording traditions, which they pretended to have received, concerning the discourses and miracles of Christ and his apostles, they endeavoured to recommend some particular opinions, which they had

[i] Ib. p. 264, 265. [k] Cited vol. iv. p. 98, from H. E. l. iii. cap. 3. p. 72. A.

[l] Cited vol. iv. p. 97, from Euseb. H. E. l. iii. cap. 25. p. 97.

[m] See vol. iii. p. 435.

embraced. The presbyter, who was convicted of having composed the Acts of Paul and Thecla, as we are assured by[n] Tertullian, alleged, that he had done it out of love to Paul. Serapion, bishop of Antioch, about the year 200, in his censure of the gospel of Peter, says: 'Having[o] read it 'over, we have found, that the main part of the book is 'agreeable to the right doctrine of our Saviour. But there 'are some other things, which we have noted.' In the Recognitions, which probably are the same[p] as the Acts, Travels, Circuits of Peter, are references to the gospels, the Acts, and some of the epistles of the New Testament; and the truth of the principal facts of it is supposed; as may be seen in our extracts out of that[q] work. It is now generally supposed upon the ground of some things said by [r] Irenæus and [s] the author of the additions to Tertullian's book of Prescriptions, that the Valentinians had a book called 'the Gospel 'of Truth,' or 'the Gospel of Valentinus:' nevertheless the Valentinians received all the books of the New Testament, as we are assured both by [t] Tertullian and [u] Irenæus. Mill thinks, that [v] Valentinus was singular in this: I rather think it was the common method. Jerom[w] mentions a book entitled the 'Gospel of Apelles:' and yet it cannot be questioned, that Apelles received the scriptures of the New Testament; though, perhaps, after the manner of his master Marcion, with razures and mutilations. The Anabaticon, or Revelation of Paul, was founded upon what the apostle says, 2 Cor. xii. 1, 2, as Epiphanius[x] supposeth. I make no question but that the composers of these writings received the books of the New Testament, and allowed the truth of the things contained in them, though they understood them differently from other christians. Some of the authors of these works might reject the scriptures of the Old Testament, but it is likely, that most of them received the same books of the New Testament which were received by the catholic christians of their times, and allowed them a like authority. Accordingly the Manichees and Priscillianists,

[n] See vol. ii. p. 305. [o] P. 265. [p] P. 364—366.
[q] Vol. ii. p. 370—376. [r] Iren. l. iii. cap. 11. p. 192.
[s] Præscr. Hær. cap. 49. p. 253.
[t] Neque enim, si Valentinus integro instrumento uti videtur, non callidiore ingenio, quam Marcion, manus intulit veritati. Præscr. Hær. cap. 38. p. 246.
[u] *Και ουκ μονον εκ των ευαγγελικων και αποστολικων πειρωνται τας αποδειξεις ποιεισθαι—αλλα και εκ νομων και προφητων.* Iren. l. i. cap. 3. p. 17.
[v] Peculiare autem Valentino id erat, quod unâ cum evangelio proprio, 'integro instrumento' uteretur, teste Tertulliano. Prol. num. 266.
[w] Præf. in Comm. sup. Matth. T. iv. p. 1.
[x] Hær. 38. num. ii. p. 177. C.

who made use of apocryphal books, received all the books of the New Testament which other christians did; at least this is allowed of the Priscillianists. They therefore, who, out of a regard to these books, or the great number of them, attempt to set aside, or diminish the authority of the books of the New Testament, now commonly received, are not countenanced by those who in ancient times made the most of them, and showed them the greatest respect, and go beyond the intention even of the authors themselves.

3. Few or none of these books were composed before the beginning of the second century.

There should be an exception made for the gospel according to the Hebrews; which, probably, was either St. Matthew's gospel, in his original Hebrew, with some additions of no bad tendency; or, as I rather think, a Hebrew translation of St. Matthew's Greek original, with the additions before mentioned: undoubtedly that gospel appeared in the first century.

The Acts of Paul and Thecla likewise must have been composed before the end of the first century, or in the very beginning of the second, if the presbyter who composed them was censured for so doing by St. John, as [y] Jerom says: but that particular is not mentioned by Tertullian.

St. Luke speaks of 'many,' who before him, had 'undertaken' to write histories of our Saviour; but those histories, being slight and defective, presently disappeared, as I imagine, after the publication of St. Luke's gospel, and those of the other two evangelists, who wrote about the same time with him. I do not think that those histories or narrations are quoted by any remaining author.

The gospel according to the Egyptians is first quoted by [z] Clement of Alexandria, near the end of the second century. The same gospel is supposed to be quoted, or referred to, in the [a] fragment of an epistle ascribed to Clement of Rome; but I think it manifestly not his, and not written before the third century.

It is not needful for me to enlarge any farther now; but if there were occasion, I suppose it might be shown to be probable, that none of the other apocryphal books, of which we are now speaking, were composed until after the beginning of the second century.

As they were not composed before that time, they might well refer to the commonly received books of the New Testament, as most of them certainly do; and particularly the

[y] Vol. ii. p. 305.
[z] Ibid. p. 251.
[a] Ibid. p. 56.

Acts of Paul and Thecla, though so early a work, as was[b] formerly shown: so that these writings, which some have supposed to weaken the credit of our books of the New Testament, do really bear testimony to them.

I might add here, (what the readers of this work may easily recollect,) that christian writings of all sorts, about this time, the second century, pay tribute to the received books of the New Testament, and bear witness, that they were the only authentic records of Jesus Christ and his doctrine.

The Sibylline oracles (whatever were the particular views of the composer) owe[c] all their pretended prophecies concerning our Saviour's nativity, baptism, miracles, sufferings, death, resurrection, and ascension, to our evangelists.

The unknown author of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs bears[d] a large testimony to the facts, principles, and books of the New Testament; and, so far as was consistent with his assumed character, he declares the canonical authority of the Acts of the Apostles and St. Paul's epistles.

4. All these books are not properly spurious, though they are fitly called apocryphal.

A 'spurious' work is that which is ascribed to any man as author who did not compose it. In this sense the Recognitions are spurious, because they are ascribed to Clement of Rome, who did not write them. The like may be said of many other books; but I do not think that the gospels and Acts above mentioned are spurious in this sense. One of our universally acknowledged books of the New Testament is entitled, 'The Acts of the Apostles;' but none thereby understand, that they were composed by the apostles. We are assured that they were written by the evangelist Luke; but supposing that no name were affixed to that book, we should not ascribe it to the apostles as authors. Though there were no account in antiquity of the author of the Acts of Paul and Thecla, we should not have imagined that they were written either by St. Paul or Thecla. It is not easy to think that the book, called the Traditions of Matthias, (the[e] same as his gospel,) was composed by Matthias himself, or pretended to be so; nor were the Acts of Peter, Andrew, and other apostles, ascribed to them as authors. 'Acts,' in ancient writers, is sometimes equivalent to 'Travels,' or 'Circuits.' The Acts of Paul and Thecla are called their Travels by[f] Jerom; and the

[b] Ibid. ii. p. 331—333.
[c] Ibid. p. 339—342.
[d] Ibid. p. 363.
[e] Vid. Grabe, Spicileg. T. ii. p. 117, 118.
[f] Vol. ii. p. 305.

Acts of Peter are sometimes called his Travels or Circuits: that[5] book was so called from the subject-matter of it, as containing an account of his travels, discourses, and miracles, in several places; and it would be absurd to suppose him to have written that account himself; nor is there any reason to think it was at first ascribed to him as author. The same, as I apprehend, ought to be supposed likewise of those books called Gospels and Preachings of Peter and Paul.

These books bear, in their titles, the names of apostles. We often say, that they are written 'in the names of apos-'tles,' and we call them 'pseudepigraphal;' but it is said chiefly for the sake of brevity, and for avoiding long circumlocutions. For preventing mistakes, that way of speaking might sometimes be declined. In a sense, these books are pseudepigraphal: many things in them are imputed to the apostles, which they neither said nor did; the histories of them, related in those gospels and Acts, are false, fictitious, romantic; but the works themselves were not composed by apostles; nor were they at first ascribed to them, as I apprehend.

But they are fitly called 'apocryphal;' for they have in their titles the names of apostles, and they make a specious pretence of delivering a true history of their doctrine, discourses, miracles, and travels; though that history is not true and authentic, and was not written by any apostle or apostolical man.

5. The publication of these apocryphal or pseudepigraphal books, may be accounted for; it was very much owing to the fame of Christ and his apostles.

The many 'narrations,' or short histories, referred to by St. Luke, in the introduction to his gospel, were owing probably to an honest zeal for Christ and his honour; and the composers supposed, that their histories would be acceptable to many, who had heard of Jesus, and believed in him: but being defective, they were soon laid aside; and the gospels of the four evangelists, when published, were universally received by the faithful, as the authentic histories of Jesus Christ.

The apocryphal gospels and Acts published afterwards, were also owing to the fame of Christ and his apostles, and the great success of their ministry. By the end of the first, or the beginning of the second century, there were in the church many learned men, converts from the several sects of philosophy, especially in the eastern part of the empire. These read the scriptures of the New Testament, but they did not

[5] Vol. ii. p. 366.

rightly interpret them: bringing with them their philosophical principles, and having been used to schemes of philosophy, they formed to themselves a scheme of religion, different from that commonly received among christians. These peculiar opinions they endeavoured to support by philosophical reasonings; and in order to recommend them, they also laid hold of such traditions concerning Christ and his apostles, though groundless, as were at all favourable to them. These, with fictitious discourses and histories of their own invention, they, or some of their admirers, inserted into a volume; which they published with the title of the Gospel, Acts, or Travels, of some apostle. To this it is owing, that[h] in so many of this sort of books may be observed the doctrine of two principles, the evil nature of matter, a wrong notion concerning the person of Christ as man in appearance only, a disadvantageous opinion of marriage, and the like.

6. The case of the apostles of Christ is not singular.

Many men of distinguished characters have had discourses made for them, which themselves knew nothing of; and actions imputed to them, which they never performed; and eminent writers have often had works ascribed to them, of which they were not the authors. Nevertheless, very few impostures of this kind have prevailed in the world, all men being unwilling to be deceived, and many being upon their guard, and readily exerting themselves to detect and expose such things. Says Augustine, in his argument with the Manichees, 'No[i] writings ever had a better testimony af-'forded them, than those of the apostles and evangelists: 'nor does it weaken the credit and authority of books re-'ceived by the church from the beginning, that some other 'writings have been without ground, and falsely, ascribed 'to the apostles; for the like has happened, for instance, to 'Hippocrates; but yet his genuine works have been dis-'tinguished from others, which have been published under 'his name.' Many other such instances might be alleged. Divers orations were falsely ascribed to [k]Demosthenes, and [l]Lysias, as is observed by Dionysius of Halicarnassus. The same critic and historian has[m] catalogues of the genuine and spurious orations of Dinarchus. Many things[n] were

[h] See vol. iii. p. 432, 433. and likewise vol. ii. p. 265.

[i] Vol. iii. p. 424.

[k] Dionys. de admirandâ vi dicendi, in Dem. sect. 57. Tom. ii. p. 320. et alibi. Ed. Huds.

[l] De Lysiâ Judic. sect. 12. p. 135. Ibid.

[m] De Dinarch. Jud. sect. 9, 10, 11. T. ii. p. 184—186.

[n] Aul. Gell. Noct. Att. l. 3. cap. 3.

published in the name of Plautus which were not his. Some works were ascribed to [n] Virgil, and [o] Horace, which were not theirs. The Greek and Roman critics distinguished the genuine and spurious works of those famous writers. The primitive christians acted in the like manner: they did not presently receive every thing proposed to them; they admitted nothing which was not well recommended. Says Serapion, bishop of Antioch, in his examination of the gospel of Peter, 'We[p] receive Peter and the other apostles, as 'Christ; but as skilful men we reject those writings which 'are falsely ascribed to them.' We have seen many proofs of the caution and circumspection of christians in former times. For a good while, the epistle to the Hebrews, some of the catholic epistles, and the Revelation, were doubted of by many, when other books of the New Testament were universally acknowledged. The titles of the numerous Gospels and Acts above mentioned, and the remains of them, whether entire, or fragments only, are monuments of the care, skill, and good judgment of the primitive christians, and of the presidents of the churches, and their other learned guides and conductors; and we have all the satisfaction which can be reasonably desired, that the books received by them were received upon good ground, and that others were as justly rejected.

If these observations are right, (as I hope they are,) they may be sufficient to show, that the books now, and for a long time, called 'apocryphal,' or 'pseudepigraphal,' afford no valid argument against either the genuineness or the authority of the books of the New Testament, generally received, as written by apostles and evangelists.

[n] Quamvis igitur multa *ψευδεπιγραφα*, id est, falsâ inscriptione, sub alieno nomine sint prolata, ut Thyestes tragœdia hujus poëtæ, quam Varius edidit pro suâ, et alia hujuscemodi; tamen Bucolica liquido Virgilii esse minime dubitandum est. Donat. in Vitâ Virgil.

[o] Venerunt in manus et Elegi sub titulo ejus, et Epistola prosâ oratione, quasi commendans se Mæcenati. Sed utraque falsa puto. Nam Elegi vulgares, Epistola etiam obscura. Quo vitio minime tenebatur. Sueton. in Vitâ Horat.

[p] Vol. ii. p. 264.

A

SUPPLEMENT

TO THE

SECOND PART

OF

THE CREDIBILITY

OF THE

GOSPEL HISTORY.

A

HISTORY

OF THE

APOSTLES AND EVANGELISTS,

WRITERS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

CHAP. I.

General denominations of the collection of sacred books received by christians. I. *Scripture.* II. *Bible.* III. *Canon.* IV. *Old and New Testament.* V. *Instrument.* VI. *Digest.* VII. *Gospel.*

I. ONE of the general denominations of the sacred books is Scripture, or Scriptures, literally or primarily signifying writing. But by way of eminence and distinction the books in highest esteem are called Scripture, or the Scriptures.

This word occurs often in the New Testament, in the gospels, the Acts, and the epistles. Whereby we perceive, that in the time of our Saviour and his apostles this word was in common use, denoting the books received by the Jewish people, as the rule of their faith. To them have been since added by christians the writings of the apostles and evangelists, completing the collection of books, received by them as sacred and divine.

Some of the places, where the word scripture is used in the singular number for the books of the Old Testament, are these: 2 Tim. iii. 16, "All scripture is given by inspiration of God." And Luke iv. 21; John ii. 22; Acts i. 16; viii. 32, 35; Rom. iv. 3; Gal. iii. 8; James ii. 8, 23; 1 Pet. ii. 62; Pet. i. 20. Scriptures, in the plural number, in these following, and many other places. Matt.

xxi. 42; xxii. 29; xxvi. 54; Luke xxiv. 27, 32, 45; John v. 39; Acts xvii. 2, 11; xviii. 24, 28; 2 Tim. iii. 15; 2 Pet. iii. 16.

St. Peter applies this word to the books of the New as well as of the Old Testament, to St. Paul's epistles in particular: 2 Pet. iii. 16,—" as also in all his epistles,—which they that are unlearned wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction." Plainly denoting, that[a] St. Paul's epistles are scriptures in the highest sense of the word.

II. Bible is another word, which has now been long in use among christians, denoting the whole collection of writings received by them as of divine authority.

The word, primarily, denotes book: but now is given to the writings of prophets and apostles by way of eminence. This collection is the Book or Bible, the book of books, as superior in excellence to all other books. The word seems to be used in this sense by Chrysostom in a passage already[b] cited. 'I therefore exhort all of you to procure to 'yourselves Bibles, *βιβλια*. If you have nothing else, take 'care to have the New Testament, particularly the Acts of 'the Apostles, and the gospels, for your constant instructors.' And Jerom says, 'That[c] the scriptures, being all written by 'one Spirit, are called one book.' We likewise saw formerly a passage of Augustine, where he informs us, 'That[d] some 'called all the canonical scriptures one book, on account 'of their wonderful harmony, and unity of design through-'out.' And I then said: 'It is likely, that this way of 'speaking gradually brought in the general use of the word 'Bible, for the whole collection of the scriptures, or the 'books of the Old and New Testament.'

In short, the ancient christians were continually speaking of the divine oracles, and the divine books, and were much employed in reading them, as Chrysostom directs in a passage transcribed[e] below: where he recommends the reading the divine books daily, forenoon and afternoon. At length the whole collection was called the Book, or the Bible.

[a] Hac parte (quod bene notandum est) Petrus canonizat, ut ita loquar, id est, in canonem sacrarum scripturarum ascribit, atque canonicas facit, epistolas Pauli. Dicens enim, 'sicut et cæteras scripturas,' utique significat, se etiam illas in scripturarum numero habere. De sacris autem scripturis eum loqui, in confesso est. Est. in loc.

[b] Vol. iv. ch. cxviii. num. xii. 13.

[c] Ibid. ch. cxiv. num. xi. 1.

[d] Ibid. ch. cxvii. num. x. 14.

[e] *Αλλα δει παντα καιρον επιτηδειον ηγεισθαι προς την των πνευματικων λογων διαλεξιν.—Δυνησομεθα και επι οικιας διατριβοντες, και μετα την εστιασιν, και προ της εστιασεως μετα χειρας λαβοντες τα θεια βιβλια την εξ αυτων καρπεσθαι ωφελειαν.* In i. Gen. Hom. x. T. iv. p. 81. C. Bened.

Dr. Heumann has an epistle, or short dissertation[f] concerning the origin of this name of our sacred collection of books. And for some while he was of opinion, that[g] it was so called, as being the most excellent of all books: in like manner as the Jews had before called their collection the scriptures, by way of eminence. So Acts xviii. 24 and 28. But[h] afterwards he suspected, that the origin of this name was in those words of Paul, 2 Tim. iv. 13. "The cloak that I left at Troas with Carpus, when thou comest, bring with thee, and the books: *και τα βιβλια.*" For he believed, that thereby the ancient christians understood the sacred code. But he afterwards acknowledgeth, that he had not found any instance of that interpretation in ancient writers. It seems to me therefore, that this conjecture should be dropt, as destitute of foundation; and that it should be better for us to adhere to the fore-mentioned origin of this name, which appears to have in it a good deal of probability.

III. Canon is originally a Greek word, signifying a rule or standard, by which other things are to be examined and judged.

As the writings of the prophets and apostles and evangelists contain an authentic account of the revealed will of God, they are the rule of the belief and practice of those who receive them.

Sometimes canon seems equivalent to a list or catalogue in which are inserted those books, which contain the rule of faith.

Du Pin says, 'This[i] word signifies not only a law or 'rule, but likewise a table, catalogue, list. Some have sup- 'posed, that the canonical books were so called, because 'they are the rule of the faith. But though it be true, 'that they are the rule of our faith: yet the reason of their 'being called canonical, is, because they are placed in the 'catalogue of sacred books.'

Perhaps, there is no need to dispute about this; for there

[f] De Origine Nominis Bibliorum. Heum. Pœcile. Tom. I. p. 412—415.

[g] Suspicari deinde cœpi, ideo 'Biblia' dictum esse sacrum codicem, quod tanquam liber omnium præstantissimus, *κατ' εξοχην* dictus sit *τα βιβλια.* Suppetias conjecturæ huic ferre videbatur illa appellatio, quâ idem divinum opus vocari solet *αι γραφαι.* e. gr. Act. xviii. 24, 28. Id. ib. p. 413.

[h] Ib. p. 414.

[i] Le mot signifie non seulement une loi, une règle, mais aussi une table, un catalogue, une liste—Quelques uns ont cru que les livres canoniques étoient ainsi appellés parcequ'ils sont la règle de la foi. Mais, quoique cela soit vrai, ce n'est pas ce qui leur a fait donner le nom de canoniques, qu'ils n'ont que parceque l'on a nommé canon le catalogue des livres sacrés. Diss. Prelim. l. 1. ch. I. sect. 2.

is no great difference in those two senses: and there may be passages of ancient writers, where it would be difficult to determine which of them is intended.

St. Paul has twice used the word canon, or rule. Gal. vi. 16, "As many as walk according to this rule." Upon which verse Theodoret's comment is to this purpose; 'He[k] 'calls the fore-mentioned doctrine a rule, as being straight, 'and having nothing wanting, nor superfluous.' Again says St. Paul, Philip. iii. 16, "Whereunto we have already attained, let us walk according to the same rule." Where he speaks of the doctrine of the gospel in general, or of some particular maxim of it: not of any books containing the rule of faith. However, his use of the word may have been an occasion of affixing that denomination to the books of scripture; for it is of great antiquity among christians.

Irenæus, speaking of the scriptures, as the words of God, calls[l] them the rule, or canon of truth. Here canon is not a catalogue, but the books, or the doctrine contained in the books of scripture.

Clement of Alexandria, referring to a quotation of the gospel according to the Egyptians, says with indignation: 'But[m] they who choose to follow any thing, rather than 'the true evangelical canon, [or the canon of the gospel,] 'insist upon what follows there as said to Salome.' In another place he says: 'The[n] ecclesiastical canon is the 'consent and agreement of the law and the prophets with 'the testament delivered by the Lord.'

Eusebius, as[o] formerly quoted, says of Origen: 'But in 'the first book of his Commentaries upon the gospel of 'Matthew, observing[p] the ecclesiastical canon, he declares 'that he knew of four gospels only.'

I shall add a few more passages from later writers, chiefly such as have been already quoted in the foregoing volumes: to which passages therefore the reader may easily have recourse.

[k] Κανονα εκαλεσε την προκειμενην διδασκαλιαν, ὡς ευθυτητι κοσμεμενην, και μητε ελλειπον τι, μητε περιττον εχουσαν. Theod. in loc.

[l] Nos autem unum et solum verum Deum doctorem sequentes, et regulam veritatis habentes ejus sermones, de iisdem semper eadem dicimus omnes. Iren. l. 4. c. 35. al. 69. f. p. 277.

[m] See Vol. ii. p. 251.

[n] Κανων δε εκκλησιαστικος ἡ συνωδια και ἡ συμφωνια νομε τε και προφητων τῃ κατα την τε Κυριε παρουσιαν παραδιδομενῃ διαθηκῃ. Cl. Strom. l. 6. p. 676.

[o] Vol. ii. p. 494.

[p] ——τον εκκλησιαστικον φυλαττων κανονα. Ap. Euseb. l. 6. c. 25. p. 226. B.

Athanasius[q] in his Festal Epistle speaks of three sorts of books, the canonical, the same which are now received by us, such as were allowed to be read, and then of such as are apocryphal: by which he means books forged by heretics.

In the synopsis of scripture, ascribed to him, but probably not written till above a hundred years after this time, near the end of the fifth century, is frequent mention[r] of canonical and uncanonical books.

The council of Laodicea, about 363, ordains, that[s] 'no 'books, not canonical, should be read in the church, but 'only the canonical books of the Old and New Testa-'ment.'

Rufinus, enumerating the scriptures of the Old and New Testament, makes[t] three sorts of books; such[u] as are included in the canon: such as are not canonical, but ecclesiastical, allowed to be read, but not to be alleged for proof of any doctrine; and lastly, apocryphal books, which were not to be publicly read.

Jerom likewise often speaks of the canon of scripture, as we saw in his chapter, where he says: Ecclesiasticus,[v] 'Judith, Tobit, and the Shepherd, are not in the canon:' and 'that[w] the church reads, or allows to be read, Judith, 'Tobit, and the Maccabees, but does not receive them 'among the canonical scriptures: and that they, and the 'books of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus, may be read for the 'edification of the people, but not as of authority for prov-'ing any doctrines.' And for the Old Testament he recommends[x] the true Jewish canon, or Hebrew verity. I refer below to[y] another place relating to the books of the New Testament.

The third council of Carthage, about 397, ordains, 'that[z] 'nothing beside the canonical scriptures be read in the 'church under the name of Divine Scriptures.'

Augustine, in 395, and afterwards, often[a] speaks of canonical scriptures, and the[b] whole canon of scripture, that is,

[q] Vol. iv. p. 156. [r] Ib. p. 161—164.
[s] Ib. p. 182. [t] Ib. ch. cxv.
[u] Hæc sunt quæ patres intra canonem concluserunt, & ex quibus fidei nostræ assertiones constare voluerunt—Sciendum tamen est, quod alii libri sunt, qui non sunt canonici, sed ecclesiastici a majoribus appellati sunt—Quæ omnia legi quidem in ecclesiis voluerunt, non tamen proferri ad auctoritatem ex his fidei confirmandam. Cæteras vero scripturas apocryphas nominârunt, quas in ecclesiis legi noluerunt. Rufin. citat. ubi supra, p. 185. note [g].
[v] Vol. iv. p. 420. [w] P. 421. [x] P. 425.
[y] P. 439, 440. [z] P. 486. [a] P. 492.
[b] Totus autem canon scripturarum———his libris continetur. Ibid. note [s].

all the sacred books of the Old and New Testament. We [c] read of some, says he, that "they searched the scriptures 'daily, whether those things were so," Acts xvii. 11. What 'scriptures, I pray, except the canonical scriptures of the 'law and the prophets? To them have been since added 'the gospels, the epistles of apostles, the Acts of the Apos-'tles, and the Revelation of John.' Of the superior authority of the canonical scriptures to all others, he speaks frequently in passages afterwards alleged [d] in the same chapter.

Chrysostom, in a place already cited, [e] says: 'They [f] fall 'into great absurdities who will not follow the rule (or 'canon) of the divine scripture, but trust entirely to their 'own reasoning.' I refer to another place [g] to the like purpose.

Says Isidore of Pelusium, about 412: 'That [h] these 'things are so, we shall perceive, if we attend to the rule '[canon] of truth, the divine scriptures.'

And Leontius of Constantinople, about 610, having cited the whole catalogue of the books of scripture from Genesis to the Revelation,[i] concludes; 'These [k] are the ancient and 'the new books, which are received in the church as ca-'nonical.'

By all which we discern, how much the use of these words, canon and canonical, has obtained among christians, denoting those books which are of the highest authority, and the rule of faith; as opposed to all other whatever, particularly to ecclesiastical, or the writings of orthodox and learned catholics, and to apocryphal, the productions chiefly of heretics, which by a specious name and title made a pretension to be accounted among sacred books.

IV. The most common and general division of the canonical books is that of ancient and new, or the Old and New Testament. The Hebrew word *berith*, from which it is translated, properly signifies [l] covenant. St. Paul, 2 Cor.

[c] Vol. iv. ch. cxvii. num. x. 1.

[d] Num. x. & xi.

[e] Vol. v. Recapitulation of chap. cxviii.

[f] Ὁρᾳς, εις ὁσην ατοπιαν εκπιπτουσιν οἱ μη βουλομενοι τῳ της θειας γραφης κατακολουθειν κανονι. κ. λ. In Gen. cap. 33. hom. 58. T. iv. p. 566. P.

[g] Vid. hom. 33. in Act. Ap. sub fin.

[h] Ὁτι δε ταυτα ουτως εχει, τον κανονα της αληθειας, τας θειας φημι γραφας, κατοπτευσωμεν. Isid. ep. 114. l. 4.

[i] See Vol. v. p. 142.

[k] Ταυτα εστι τα κανονιζομενα βιβλια εν τῃ εκκλησιᾳ, και παλαια και νεα. Citat. ibid. p. 380. note [e].

[l] Notandum, quod *Berith*, verbum Hebraïcum, Aquila συνθηκην, id est, *pactum*, interpretatur: LXX semper διαθηκην, id est, *testamentum*: et in plerisque scripturarum locis testamentum non voluntatem defunctorum sonare, sed pactum viventium. Hieron. in Malach. cap. ii. T. iii. p. 1816.

iii. 6—18, showing the superior excellence of the gospel covenant, or the dispensation by Christ, above the legal covenant, or the dispensation by Moses, useth the word testament, not only for the covenant itself, but likewise for the books in which it is contained. At least he does so in speaking of the legal covenant. For, representing the case of the unbelieving part of the Jewish people, he says, ver. 14. "Until this day remaineth the same veil untaken away in reading the Old Testament."

It is no wonder therefore that this way of speaking has much prevailed among christians. Melito, bishop of Sardis, about the year 177, went into the east, to get an exact account of the books of the law and the prophets. In his letter to his friend Onesimus, giving an account of his journey, and reckoning up the books in their order, he calls them [m] the ancient books, and [n] the books of the Old Testament. Eusebius calls it [g] 'a catalogue of the ac-'knowledged scriptures of the Old Testament.' Our ecclesiastical historian elsewhere [p] speaks of the scriptures of the New Testament. I shall remind my readers of but one instance more. Cyril of Jerusalem, introducing his catalogue of scriptures received by the christian church, says: 'These [q] things we are taught by the divinely-in-'spired scriptures of the Old and New Testament.' Many other like examples occur in the preceding volumes of this work.

V. Instead of testament, Latin writers sometimes use the word instrument, denoting writing, charter, record. We find it several times in Tertullian, reckoned the most ancient Latin writer of the church now remaining. In a passage already [r] cited he calls the gospels, or the New Testament in general, the evangelic instrument. And says; 'How [s] large chasms Marcion has made in the epistle to 'the Romans, by leaving out what he pleases, may appear 'from our entire instrument;' or our unaltered copies of the New Testament, particularly of that epistle. Speaking of the shepherd of Hermas, he says, 'it [t] was not reckoned

[m] Ετι δε και μαθειν την των παλαιων βιβλιων εβελητης ακριβειαν. κ. λ. Ap. Euseb. l. 4. c. 27. p. 148. D.

[n] ———Και ακριβως μαθων τα της παλαιας διαθηκης βιβλια. Ib. p. 149. A.

[o] Ibid. p. 148. D. [p] See Vol. iv. p. 141.

[q] The same, p. 172. [r] See Vol. ii. p. 273.

[s] Quantas autem foveas in istâ vel maxime epistolâ [ad Romanos] Marcion fecerit, auferendo quæ voluit, de nostri Instrumenti integritate patebit. Adv. Marcion. l. 5. cap. 13. p. 601.

[t] Sed cederem tibi, si scriptura Pastoris—divino instrumento meruisset incidi—— De Pudicit. cap. 10. p. 727. A.

a part of the divine instrument: thereby meaning, as it seems, the New Testament: which passage was quoted by us [u] formerly. He calls [v] the law and the prophets the Jewish instruments: that is, writings or scriptures. He speaks of the antiquity [w] of the Jewish instruments or scriptures. He [x] seems in one place to use the word instrument, as equivalent to scriptures, containing the doctrine of revelation, or the revealed will of God.

VI. Digest is another word used by Tertullian in speaking of the scriptures. 'Luke's [y] digest,' he says, 'is often 'ascribed to Paul.' He calls [z] the gospels, or the whole New Testament 'our digest,' in allusion, as it seems, to some collection of the Roman laws digested into order. Those two passages were cited in the chapter of Tertullian. I now transcribe the latter below [a] more at large, it having also the word instrument, as equivalent to the New Testament. He likewise calls the Jewish scriptures [b] 'Sacred 'Digests.' He seems to use the word digest [c] elsewhere, as equivalent to writing, or work in general.

I shall not take notice of any other general denominations of the sacred scriptures.

VII. My chief concern is with the New Testament, which, as is well known, consists of gospels, the Acts, and epistles. The only word that needs explanation is the first.

Gospel is a translation of the Greek word *ευαγγελιον*, the Latin word *evangelium*, which signifies any good message

[u] See Vol. ii. p. 303.

[v] Aut numquid non justi Judæi, et quibus pœnitentiâ non opus esset, habentes gubernacula disciplinæ et timoris instrumenta, legem et prophetas. De Pudicitiâ, Cap. 7. p. 722. B.

[w] Primam instrumentis istis auctoritatem summa antiquitas vindicat. Apol. cap. 19. p. 19. B.

Sed quoniam edidimus, antiquissimis Judæorum instrumentis sectam istam esse suffultam. Apol. cap. 21. in. p. 20.

[x] Sed quo plenius et impressius tam ipsum, quam dispositiones ejus et voluntates adiremus, instrumentum adjecit literaturæ, si quis velit de Deo inquirere. Apol. cap. 18. p. 18. C.

[y] See Vol. ii. p. 275.

[z] See Vol. ii. p. 299.

[a] Si vero apostoli quidem integrum evangelium contulerunt, de solâ convictûs inæqualitate reprehensi, Pseudapostoli autem veritatem eorum interpolârunt, et inde sunt nostra digesta; quod erit germanum illud apostolorum instrumentum, quod adulteros passum est? Adver. Marc. l. 4. cap. 3. p. 504. B.

[b] Sed homines gloriæ, ut diximus, et eloquentiæ solius libidinosi, si quid in sanctis offenderunt digestis, exinde regestum pro instituto curiositatis ad propria verterunt. Apol. cap. 47. p. 41. B.

[c] Elegi ad compendium Varronis opera, qui rerum divinarum ex omnibus retro digestis commentatus, idoneum se nobis scopum exposuit. Ad Nation. l. 2. cap. i. p. 64. C.

or tidings. In the New Testament the word denotes the doctrine of salvation, taught by Jesus Christ and his apostles: which indeed is gospel by way of eminence, as it is the best tidings that ever were published in this world. Says Theodoret upon Rom. i. 1, 'He[d] calls it gospel, as 'it contains assurance of many good things. For it 'proclaims peace with God, the overthrow of Satan, 'the remission of sins, the abolishing of death, the re-'surrection of the dead, eternal life, and the kingdom of 'heaven.'

Says St. Matthew, iv. 23, "And Jesus went all about Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom." *Και κηρυσσων το ευαγγελιειν της βασιλειας.* Mark xiii. 10, "And the gospel [*το ευαγγελιον*] must first be preached to all nations." Ch. xvi. 15, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." *Κηρυξατε το ευαγγελιον.* It is called "the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation," Eph. i. 13. And in like manner in other places.

But by gospel, when used by us concerning the writings of the evangelists, we mean the history of Christ's preaching and miracles. The word seems also to be so used by St. Mark, i. 1, "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ." Which may be understood and paraphrased thus: 'Here[e] begins the history of the life and doctrine 'of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and Saviour of man-'kind.'

St. Luke, referring to the book of his gospel, says, Acts i. 1, 2, "The former treatise have I made, O Theophilus, of all that Jesus began to do and teach, until the day in the which he was taken up, after that he through the Holy Ghost had given commandments unto the apostles whom he had chosen." But St. Luke, as it seems, there puts the principal part for the whole. For he has therein written also the history of our Lord's miraculous birth, and divers extraordinary events attending it: and likewise the history

[d] *Ευαγγελιον δε το κηρυγμα προσηγορευσεν, ως πολλων αγαθων υπισχνεμενον χορηγιαν. Ευαγγελιζεται γαρ τας τε Θεε καταλλαγας, την τε διαβολε καταλυσιν, των ἁμαρτηματων την αφεσιν, τε θανατε την παυλαν, των νεκρων την αναστασιν, την ζωην την αιωνιον, την βασιλειαν των ερανων.* In ep. ad Rom. T. iii. p. 10. B.

[e] That is Dr. Clarke's paraphrase. But I am sensible it will not be allowed by all. Œcumenius says, that by *Gospel* Mark does not intend his own writing, but Christ's preaching. *Μαρκος, Αρχη, φησι, τε ευαγγελιε Ιησε Χριστε· αλλα ε την ἑαυτε συγγραφην καλει ευαγγελιον, αλλα το τε Χριστε κηρυγμα.* Œcum. in Act. Ap. He proceeds to say, that the faithful afterwards called the writings of the evangelists gospels, as truly containing the gospel, that is, the doctrine of Christ. See Vol. v. p. 155.

of the birth of John the Baptist, and divers circumstances of it, and his preaching and death.

In this sense the word gospel is frequently understood by us. A gospel is the history of Jesus Christ, his doctrine, miracles, resurrection and ascension: not excluding the history of his forerunner, who[f] also is said to have preached the gospel, that is, the doctrine of the gospel, or the kingdom of God.

The gospel according to Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, is the history of Jesus Christ, as written by those several evangelists.

CHAP. II.

General observations upon the Canon of the New Testament.

I. THE canonical books of the New Testament received by christians in this part of the world, are the four gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, fourteen epistles of St. Paul, seven catholic epistles, and the Revelation.

II. There may be different canons of the New Testament among christians.

Indeed, there have been in former times, and still are, different sentiments among christians, concerning the number of books to be received as canonical. The[a] canon of the Syrian churches is not the same as ours. Jerom tells us, that[b] in his time some of the Latins rejected the epistle to the Hebrews, and some of the Greeks the book of the Revelation. From Chrysostom's works we perceive, that[c] he did not receive the second epistle of St. Peter, nor the second and third of St. John, nor the epistle of St. Jude, nor the Revelation. And there is reason to think, that[d] Theo-

[f] Mat. iii. 1, 2, "In those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judea, and saying: Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." Compare Mark i. 4; Luke iii. 1, 2. And says St. Luke, iii. 18, "And many other things in his exhortation preached he unto the people." Πολλα μεν ουν και ἑτερα παρακαλων, ευηγγελιζετο τον λαον. Which may be literally rendered thus: "And exhorting many other like things, he evangelized [or preached the gospel to] the people."

[a] See Vol. iv. ch. ciii. and Vol. v. ch. cxlviii. num. ii. 9.

[b] Vol. iv. ch. cxiv. num. viii. 5. [c] The same, ch. cxviii. num. x.

[d] Vol. v. p. 19.

doret's canon likewise was much the same with Chrysostom's, and that of the churches in Syria. Nevertheless, we have observed in the course of this work, that about the same time the Egyptians, and the christians in divers other parts of the world, had the same number of canonical books that we have.

But to come nearer our own time, Calvin, [e] Grotius,[f] Le Clerc, [g] Philip Limborch, [h] and some other learned moderns, have not admitted the epistle to the Hebrews to have been written by St. Paul: though [i] they were willing to allow it to be the work of an apostolical man, and a valuable part of sacred scripture. But I cannot say, that they were in the right in so doing. For it appears to me to have been a maxim of the ancient christians not to receive any doctrinal or preceptive writing, as of authority, unless it were known to be the work of an apostle. Consequently, the epistle to the Hebrews, if written by an apostolical man only, should not be esteemed canonical.

Grotius [k] likewise supposed the second epistle ascribed to Peter, not to have been written by the apostle Simon Peter, but by Simeon, chosen bishop of Jerusalem after the death of James the Just, whose epistle we have. Which Simeon lived to the time of Trajan, when he was crucified for the name of Christ. Upon which I only observe at present, that if this Simeon be the writer of this epistle, it should not be a part of canonical scripture.

The same learned man supposeth [l] the second and third

[e] Ego, ut Paulum agnoscam auctorem, adduci nequeo. Calvin. Argum. in ep. ad Hebr. [f] Facillima refutatu est postrema hæc opinio, ideo quod Paulinæ epistolæ inter se sint germanæ, pari charactere ac dicendi modo; hæc vero manifeste ab iis discrepet, selectiores habens voces Græcas, leniusque fluens, non autem fracta brevibus incisis, ac salebrosa—Grot. Procem. in ep. ad Hebr.

[g] Hist. Ec. Ann. 69. p. 455—461. [h] Prolegom. in ep. ad Hebr.

[i] Hisce argumentis utrinque attente expensis, dicendum videtur, Paulum epistolæ hujus scriptorem non videri—Quis vero illius scriptor sit, incertum est. Alii eam Lucæ, alii Barnabæ, alii Clementi adscribunt—Interim divinam hujus epistolæ auctoritatem agnoscimus, multisque aliis, quas ab apostolis esse scriptas constat, ob argumenti quod tractat præstantiam, præferendam judicamus. Limb. ibid. Vid. et Calvin. ubi supra.

[k] Jam olim veterum multi credidere non esse apostoli Petri, argumento tum dictionis ab epistolà priore multum diversæ, quod agnoscunt Eusebius et Hieronymus, tum quod multæ olim ecclesiæ hanc non receperint—Scriptorem autem hujus epistolæ arbitror esse Simeonem, sive Simonem, episcopum post Jacobi mortem Hierosolymis, ejusdemque Jacobi, cujus epistolam habemus, successorem et imitatorem—Unde etiam constat, vixisse hunc post excidium Hierosolymitanum ad Trajani tempora, et tunc pro nomine Christi crucifixum. Annot. in Ep. Petri secund.

[l] Hanc epistolam, et eam quæ sequitur, non esse Johannis apostoli veterum multi jam olim crediderunt a quibus non dissentiunt Eusebius et Hieronymus.

epistles, called St. John's, not to have been written by John the apostle, but by another John, an elder or presbyter who lived about the same time, and after him at Ephesus.

And the epistle called St. Jude's, he thought [m] to have been written by one of that name, who was bishop of Jerusalem in the time of the emperor Adrian, and not till after there had been several other bishops of that church, since the death of the fore-mentioned Simeon. If so, I believe all men may be of opinion, that this epistle ought not to be placed in the canon of the New Testament.

It may not be thought right, if I should here entirely omit Mr. Whiston, whose canon consisted of the [n] Apostolical Constitutions, and divers other books, as sacred, beside those generally received: and [o] the Constitutions, in particular, as the most sacred of all the canonical books of the New Testament.

Concerning which I beg leave to observe; First, that the receiving the Constitutions as a sacred book, and part of the rule of faith, would make a great alteration in the christian scheme. Some might be induced to think it no great blessing to mankind, and scarcely deserving an apology. Secondly, Mr. Whiston's canon is not the canon of the christian churches in former times; as is manifest

Et magna sunt in id argumenta. Nam duos fuisse Johannes Ephesi, apostolum, ac presbyterum ejus discipulum, semper constitit ex sepulcris, alio hujus, alio illius; quæ sepulcra vidit Hieronymus. Grot. Annot. in ep. Joan. secund.

[m] Quare omnino adducor, ut credam esse hanc epistolam Judæ episcopi Hierosolymitani, qui fuit Adriani temporibus, paulo ante Barchochebam. Id. in Annot. ad ep. Judæ.

[n] 'The sacred books of the New Testament still extant, both those in the '85th canon, and those written afterwards, are the same which we now re-'ceive; together with the eight books of the Apostolical Constitutions, and 'their epitome, the Doctrine of the Apostles; the two epistles of Clement, the 'Epistle of Barnabas, the Shepherd of Hermas, and perhaps the second book 'of Apocryphal Esdras, with the Epistles of Ignatius and Polycarp.' Essay on the Apostolical Constitutions, ch. i. p. 70, 71.

[o] 'If any one has a mind to sort the several books of the New Testament, 'he may in the first place set the Apostolical Constitutions with its extract, or 'Doctrine of the Apostles, as derived from the body, or college of the apos-'tles met in councils. In the next place he may put the four gospels, with 'their appendix, the Acts of the Apostles. The Apocalypse of John also can-'not be reckoned at all inferior to them, though it be quite of another nature 'from them. In the third rank may stand the epistles of the apostles, Paul, 'Peter, and John. In the fourth rank may stand the epistles of the brethren of 'our Lord, James and Jude. In the fifth and last rank may stand the epistles 'and writings of the companions and attendants of the apostles, Barnabas, 'Clement, Hermas, Ignatius, Polycarp. All which, with the addition per-'haps of apocryphal Esdras, and of the Apocalypse of Peter, and the Acts of 'Paul where now extant, I look upon, though in different degrees, as the sa-'cred books of the New Testament.' Ibid. p. 72, 73.

from the large collections made by us in the preceding volumes, from ecclesiastical writers of every age to the beginning of the twelfth century. Thirdly, Mr. Whiston, notwithstanding all his labours, made few converts to this opinion: which I impute to the knowledge and learning of our times. And as the christian religion is built upon facts, the study of ecclesiastical antiquity will be always needful, and may be of use to defeat various attempts of ingenious, but mistaken and prejudiced men.

III. A short canon of scripture is most eligible.

Religion is the concern of all men. A few short histories and epistles are better fitted for general use, than numerous and prolix writings. Besides, if any writings are to be received as the rule of faith and manners, it is of the utmost importance, that they be justly entitled to that distinction: otherwise men may be led into errors of very bad consequence. If any books pretend to deliver the doctrine of infallible, and divinely-inspired teachers, such as Jesus Christ and his apostles are esteemed by christians; great care should be taken to be well satisfied, that their accounts are authentic, and that they are the genuine writings of the men whose names they bear. The pretensions of writings placed in high authority, to which great credit is given, ought to be well attested.

Dr. Jortin, speaking of the work called Apostolical Constitutions, says: 'The [p] authors of them are, it is pre-'tended, the twelve apostles and St. Paul, gathered to-'gether, with Clement their amanuensis.

'If their authority should appear only ambiguous, it 'would be our duty to reject them, lest we should adopt as 'divine doctrines the commandments of men. For since 'each gospel contains the main parts of christianity, and 'might be sufficient to make men wise to salvation; there 'is less danger in diminishing, than in enlarging the num-'ber of canonical books: and less evil would have ensued 'from the loss of one of the four gospels, than from the ad-'dition of a fifth and spurious one.'

In my opinion, that is a very fine and valuable observation.

And I shall transcribe again an observation of Augustine, formerly [q] taken notice of: 'Our canonical books of scrip-'ture, which are of the highest authority with us, have 'been settled with great care. They ought to be few, 'lest their value should be diminished: and yet they

[p] Dr. Jortin's Remarks on Ecclesiastical History, Vol. I. p. 229.

[q] See Vol. iv. ch. cxvii. num. xvii.

'are so many, that their agreement throughout is won-'derful.'

IV. I have been sometimes apt to think, that the best canon of the New Testament would be that which may be collected from [r] Eusebius of Cæsarea, and seems to have been the canon of some in his time.

The canon should consist of two classes. In the first should be those books which he assures us were then universally acknowledged, and had been all along received by all Catholic Christians. These are the four gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, thirteen epistles of St. Paul, one epistle of St. Peter, and one epistle of St. John. These only should be of the highest authority, from which doctrines of religion may be proved.

In the other class should be placed those books of which Eusebius speaks, as contradicted in his time, though well known: concerning which there were doubts, whether they were written by persons whose names they bear, or whether the writers were apostles of Christ. These are the epistle to the Hebrews, the epistle of James, the second of Peter, the second and third of John, the epistle of Jude, and the Revelation. These should be reckoned doubtful, and contradicted: though many might be of opinion, that there is a good deal of reason to believe them genuine. And they should be allowed to be publicly read in christian assemblies, for the edification of the people: but not to be alleged, as affording, alone, sufficient proof of any doctrine.

That I may not be misunderstood, I must add, that there should be no third class of sacred books: forasmuch as there appears not any reason from christian antiquity to allow of that character and denomination to any christian writings, beside those above mentioned.

In this canon the preceding rule is regarded. It is a short canon. And it seems to have been thought of by some about[s] the time of the reformation.

[r] Vol. iv. p. 94—100.

[s] We learn from Paul Sarpi's History of the Council of Trent, that one of the doctrinal articles concerning sacred scripture, extracted, or pretended to be extracted, out of Luther's works, was this: 'That no books should be 'reckoned a part of the Old Testament, beside those received by the Jews; and 'that out of the New Testament should be excluded the epistle to the Hebrews, 'the epistle of James, the second of Peter, the second and third of John, the 'epistle of Jude, and the Revelation.' And there were some bishops in that council, 'who would have had the books of the New Testament divided into two classes: in one of which should be put those books only, which had 'been always received without contradiction; and in the other those which

V. Nevertheless that which is now generally received is a good canon.

For it contains not only those books, which were acknowledged by all in the time of Eusebius, and from the beginning, and seven others, which were then well known, and were next in esteem to those before mentioned, as universally acknowledged: and were more generally received as of authority, than any other controverted writings. Nor is there in them any thing inconsistent with the facts or principles delivered in the universally acknowledged books. And moreover, there may be a great deal of reason to think, that they are the genuine writings of those, to whom they are ascribed, and the writers were apostles. This evidence will be carefully examined, and distinctly considered as we proceed.

In this canon likewise the above-mentioned rule is regarded. It is a short canon. For out of it are excluded many books, which might seem to make a claim to be ranked among sacred and canonical scriptures.

VI. There are not any books, beside those now generally received by us, that ought to be esteemed canonical, or books of authority.

I suppose this to be evident to all, who have carefully attended to the history in the several volumes of this work; and that there is no reason to receive, as a part of sacred scripture, the epistle of Barnabas, the epistle of Clement, the Shepherd of Hermas, the Recognitions, the Clementine Homilies, the Doctrine of the Apostles, the Apostolical Constitutions, the Gospel of Peter, or Matthias, or Thomas, the Preaching of Peter, the Acts of Peter and Paul, of Andrew, and John, and other apostles, the Revelation of Peter and Paul, their Travels or Circuits. That these books were not received as sacred scripture, or a part of the rule of faith, by christians in former times, has been shown: nor can they therefore be reasonably received by us as such.

The only writing of all these, that seems to make a fair claim to be a part of sacred scripture, is the epistle of St. Barnabas, if genuine, as I [t] have supposed it to be. Nevertheless, I think it ought not to be received as sacred scripture, or admitted into the canon, for these reasons:

' had been rejected by some, or about which at least there had been doubts.' And Dr. Courayer, in his notes, seems to favour this proposal. See his French translation of the History of the Council of Trent. Liv. 2. ch. 43. tom. I. p. 235. and ch. 47. p. 240. and note i.

[t] See Ch. ii. Vol. ii. p. 18—21.

1. It was not reckoned a book of authority, or a part of the rule of faith, by those ancient christians, who have quoted it, and taken the greatest notice of it.

Clement of Alexandria has [u] quoted this epistle several times, but not as decisive, and by way of full proof, as we showed: nor is it so quoted by [v] Origen; nor is the epistle of Barnabas in any of [w] Origen's catalogues of the books of scripture, which we still find in his works, or are taken notice of by Eusebius. By that ecclesiastical historian, in one place it is reckoned [x] among spurious writings, that is, such as were generally rejected and supposed not to be a part of the New Testament. At other times, it is called by him [y] a controverted book, that is, not received by all.

Nor is this epistle placed among sacred scriptures by following writers, who have given catalogues of the books of the New Testament. It is wanting, particularly, in the Festal Epistle [z] of Athanasius, in [a] the catalogue of Cyril of Jerusalem, of [b] the council of Laodicea, of [c] Epiphanius, [d] Gregory Nazianzen, [e] Amphilochius, and [f] Jerom, [g] Rufinus, [h] the council of Carthage, and [i] Augustine. Nor has it been reckoned a part of the canonical scripture, by later writers.

2. Barnabas was not an apostle.

For he was not one of the twelve apostles of Christ: nor was he chosen in the room of Judas; nor is there in the Acts any account of his being chosen into the number of apostles, or appointed to be an apostle by Christ, as Paul was. What St. Luke says of Barnabas is, "that he was a good man and full of the Holy Ghost, and of faith," Acts xi. 24. And in ch. xiii. 1, he is mentioned among prophets and teachers in the church of Antioch. But St. Luke speaks in the like manner of Stephen, of whom he says, he was "a man full of faith, and of the Holy Ghost," ch. vi. 5. "full of faith and power," ch. v. 8. "full of the Holy Ghost," ch. vii. 55. And all the seven were "full of the Holy Ghost, and wisdom," ch. vi. 3.

That Barnabas was not an apostle, I think, may be concluded from Gal. ii. 9, where Paul says: "And when James, and Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given to me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship." By grace I

[u] Vol. ii. p. 247, 248.
[v] P. 528.
[w] P. 493, 494.
[x] Vol. iv. p. 97, 128.
[y] P. 97.
[z] P. 155.
[a] P. 173.
[b] P. 182.
[c] P. 187.
[d] P. 286, 287.
[e] P. 292, 293.
[f] P. 436.
[g] P. 483, 484.
[h] P. 486, 487.
[i] P. 493.

suppose St. Paul to mean the favour of the apostleship. So Rom. i. 5, "By whom we have received grace and apostleship," that is, the favour of the apostleship. Ch. xii. 3, "For I say, through the grace given to me," meaning the especial favour of the apostleship. And see ch. xv. 15; 1 Cor. xv. 10; Eph. iv. 7, compared with ver. 11.

If Barnabas had been an apostle, in the fullest sense of the word, St. Paul would not have said in the above-cited place from the second to the Galatians, "when they perceived the grace given to me," but "when they perceived the grace given to me and Barnabas." And in the preceding part of the context, particularly in ver. 7, 8, he twice says *me*, where he would have said *us*, if Barnabas had been an apostle: for he had been mentioned before, in ver. 1.

Indeed, in the Acts, where Paul and Barnabas are mentioned together, Barnabas is sometimes first named, as Acts xi. 30; xii. 25; xiii. 1, 2; and 7. xiv. 14; xv. 12, 25, which I think not at all strange among persons who were not intent upon precedence: when, too, Barnabas was the elder in years and discipleship. But in several other places Paul is first named, as in Acts xiii. 43, 46; xv. 2, 22, 35, of which no other reason can be well assigned, beside that of Paul's apostleship.

Moreover, wherever they travelled together, if there was an opportunity for discoursing, Paul spake. So at Paphos, in the island of Cyprus, Acts xiii. 6—12. And at Antioch in Pisidia, ch. xiii. 15, 16. See also ch. xiv. 12.

And that Paul was the principal person appears from that early account, after they had been in Cyprus, ch. xiii. 13. "Now when Paul and his company loosed from Paphos, they came to Perga, in Pamphylia."

However, there are some texts, which must be considered by us, as seeming to afford objections.

Acts xiv. 4, "But the multitude of the city was divided. Part held with the Jews, and part with the apostles:" that is, Paul and Barnabas, who were then at Iconium. And afterwards at Lystra, ver. 14, "Which when the apostles Barnabas and Paul heard,"—Here Barnabas is styled an apostle, as well as Paul.

To which I answer, first, both being now together, and meeting with the like treatment, might be called apostles, though only one of them was, properly, so. Secondly, it is not unlikely that Barnabas and Paul are here styled by St. Luke apostles, in regard to what had been done at Antioch, as related by him, ch. xii. 1—4, when by an express

order from heaven, they were sent forth from the church at Antioch, upon a special commission, in which they were still employed. That designation, however solemn, did not make either of them apostles of Christ in the highest sense. It was not the apostolical, which is a general commission. But it was a particular commission, as appears from that whole history, and from what is said at the conclusion of the journey, which they had taken, Acts xiv. 26, "And thence they sailed to Antioch, from whence they had been recommended to the grace of God, for the work which they had fulfilled." Nevertheless, they are not unfitly called apostles upon account of it. So 2 Cor. viii. 13, "Whether any do inquire of Titus, he is my partner, and fellow-helper concerning you: or our brethren be inquired of, they [k] are the messengers of the churches," literally, apostles of the churches, "and the glory of Christ." If those brethren, which had been appointed by the churches to go to Jerusalem, with the contributions, which had been made for the relief of the poor saints in Judea, might be called apostles; there can be no doubt, but Paul and Barnabas might be called apostles in regard to the work, to which they had been solemnly appointed by the church at Antioch.

Again, 1 Cor. ix. 5, 6, "Have we not power to lead about a sister, a wife, as well as other apostles, and as the brethren of the Lord and Cephas? Or I only, and Barnabas, have not we power to forbear working."

Some may think, that Barnabas is here supposed to be an apostle. I answer, that though Barnabas was not an apostle properly, or equally with himself, yet Paul, out of an affectionate respect to his friend, companion, and fellow-labourer, might be disposed to mention him, upon this occasion, in the manner he has done. This is said, supposing all before mentioned to have been apostles of Christ in the highest sense. But, secondly, it is not certain that all, before mentioned, were strictly apostles. It seems to me more likely, that by the brethren of the Lord some are intended, who were not apostles. If so, Paul might reasonably, and without offence, gratify his friendly disposition: and insert here the name of Barnabas, who had shared with him many fatigues and difficulties in the service of the gospel, though he was not an apostle.

I do not therefore discern any good reason from the New Testament, why Barnabas should be reckoned an apostle; but quite otherwise.

[k] Αποστολοι εκκλησιων.

The sense of the primitive christians is agreeable hereto. Few or none of them have thought Barnabas an apostle.

Clement of Alexandria has quoted Barnabas[l] five or six times. Twice he calls him apostle. In another place he calls him the apostolic Barnabas, who was one of the seventy, and fellow-labourer of Paul. These are the highest characters, which he intended to give to Barnabas, and what he means, when he calls him apostle, as is fully shown in the place just referred to.

By Tertullian, as cited by us[m] formerly, Barnabas is plainly reckoned no more than[n] a companion of apostles.

Eusebius, in a chapter concerning those who were disciples of Christ, says: 'The[o] names of our Saviour's apostles 'are well known from the gospels: but there is no where 'extant a catalogue of the seventy disciples. However, it 'is said, that Barnabas was one of them, who is expressly 'mentioned in the Acts, and in Paul's epistle to the Gala-'tians.' That learned writer therefore did not know that Barnabas was an apostle. In[p] another place of the same work, his Ecclesiastical History, he quotes a passage from the seventh book of Clement's Institutions, or Hypotoposes, where Barnabas is styled one of the seventy. In his commentary upon Isaiah[q] Eusebius computes fourteen apostles, meaning the twelve and Paul added to them, and equal to them, and James, the Lord's brother, bishop of Jerusalem, whom Eusebius did not think to be one of the twelve. Nor does he here say, that[r] he was equal to them, or Paul. However, from all these places we can be fully assured, that our learned ecclesiastical historian did not so much as suspect Barnabas to have been an apostle in the highest sense of the word.

Jerom, in the article of Barnabas, in his book of Ecclesiastical Writers, says, 'he[s] was ordained with Paul an 'apostle of the Gentiles.' But authors who write in haste, as Jerom often did, do not always express themselves exactly and properly. Jerom did not think that Barnabas was equally an apostle with Paul. This may be concluded from what there follows: 'He wrote an epistle for the

[l] Vol. ii. p. 248.

[m] P. 288.

[n] Volo tamen ex redundantiâ alicujus etiam comitis apostolorum testimonium superducere, idoneum confirmandi de proximo jure disciplinam Magistrorum. Exstat enim et Barnabæ titulus ad Hebræos. Tertull. de Pudicit. cap. 20. p. 741.

[o] ——Των δε ἑβδομηκοντα μαθητων καταλογος μεν ουδεις ουδαμη φερεται. Λεγεται γε μην εἰς αυτων Βαρναβας. κ. λ. H. E. l. 1. cap. xii.

[p] L. ii. cap. i. p. 38. D.

[q] Comm. in Es. p. 422.

[r] See Vol. iv. p. 122, 123.

[s] See Vol. iv. p. 464.

'edification of the church, which is read among the apocry-
'phal scriptures.' If Barnabas had been an apostle, strictly speaking, Jerom would not have said, 'he wrote an epistle 'for the edification of the church:' which any man might do. Nor would his epistle have been reckoned apocryphal, as Jerom here, and elsewhere[t] calls it. When Jerom says, that 'Barnabas was ordained with Paul an apostle of the 'Gentiles;' it is likely, he refers to the history in Acts xiii. 1—4, of which I have already said all that is needful.

Theodoret, as formerly quoted, says: "The[u] all-wise 'Deity committed the culture of a barren world to a few 'men, and those fishermen, and publicans, and one tent-'maker;' and to the like purpose often: which shows, that he did not reckon Barnabas an apostle in the fullest meaning of the word. If he had, he must have added, 'and one 'Levite.' The same observation may be applied to Chrysostom, who[v] in his many passages showing the wonderful progress of the gospel, often mentions the apostles Peter, a fisherman, and Paul a tent-maker, but never Barnabas a Levite.

If then Barnabas was not an apostle, an epistle written by him cannot be received as canonical, or a part of the rule of faith: forasmuch as no men, beside apostles, have the privilege of writing epistles, or other works, preceptive, and doctrinal, that shall be received by the churches, in that quality. This has been said several times in the course of this[w] work. And I still think it right.

Mark[x] and Luke, apostolical men, may write histories of our Lord's and his apostles' preaching, and doctrine, and miracles, which shall be received as sacred, and of authority. But no epistles, or other writings, delivering doctrines and precepts, (except only in the way of historical narration,) can be of authority, but those written by apostles.

Says Jerom of St. John: He[y] was at once apostle, 'evangelist, and prophet: apostle, in that he wrote letters 'to the churches as a master: evangelist, as he wrote a 'book of the gospel, which no other of the twelve apostles 'did, except Matthew: prophet, as he saw the Revelation 'in the island Patmos, where he was banished by Domitian.'

Frederic Spanheim, in his Dissertation concerning the twelve apostles, readily acknowledgeth this to be one pre-

[t] Ibid.
[u] Vol. v. p. 22—25.
[v] Vol. iv. p. 560, 561.
[w] See apostles in the alphabetical Table of principal matters.
[x] See Vol. ii. p. 249.
[y] Vol. iv. p. 446, 447.

rogative of apostles: 'That[z] they may write epistles, 'which shall be received as canonical, and of universal and 'perpetual authority in the church.'

3. Barnabas does not take upon himself the character of an apostle or a man of authority.

Near the beginning of the epistle he says: 'I[a] therefore, 'not as a teacher, but as one of you, shall lay before you a 'few things, that you may be joyful.' And somewhat lower: 'Again,[b] I entreat you, as one of you.'

He writes as a man who had gifts of the spirit, but not that full measure, which was a prerogative of apostles. 'He[c] who put the engrafted gift of his doctrine in us, 'knows, that no man has received [or learned] from me a 'truer word. But I know, that you are worthy.'

I shall add a few more very modest expressions, not suitable to an apostle.

'Thus[d] as much as in me lies, I have written to you 'with great plainness. And I hope, that according to my 'ability, I have omitted nothing conducive to your salva-'tion in the present circumstance.'

In the last chapter: 'I[e] beseech you: I ask it as a fa-'vour of you, whilst you are in this beautiful vessel of the 'body, be wanting in none of these things.' And still nearer the conclusion. 'Wherefore[f] I have endeavoured 'to write to you, according to my ability, that you might 'rejoice.'

Upon the whole, this epistle well answers the character given of Barnabas in the Acts, particularly, ch. xi. 24. "He was full of the Holy Ghost." The writer of this epistle had the gift of the spirit, though not that measure which was peculiar to apostles. "He was full of faith." The writer of this epistle had an earnest zeal for the truth and simplicity of the gospel. He was also "a good man." In this epistle we observe the mildness and gentleness, by

[z] Decimus nobis character apostolicæ *υπεροχης* est potestas scribendi ad ecclesias plures, vel ad omnes, *τοις καθολκ πιστοις*, hujusmodi epistolas, quæ in canonem referri mererentur, id est, quæ forent canonicæ, universalis et perpetuæ in ecclesiâ auctoritatis. Diss. prima de Apostol. Duod. num. xi. Opp. T. ii. p. 310. [a] Ego autem non tanquam doctor, sed unus ex vobis, demonstrabo pauca, per quæ in plurimis lætiores sitis. Barn. ep. cap. i. [b] Adhuc et hoc rogo vos tanquam unus ex vobis. Ib. cap. 4.

[c] *Οιδεν ὁ την εμφυτον δωρεαν της διδαχης αυτκ θεμενος εν ἡμιν κδεις γνησιωτερον εμαθεν απ' εμκ λογον. Αλλα οιδα, ὁτι αξιοι εστε ὑμεις.* Cap. 9.

[d] *Εφ' ὁσον ην εν δυνατῳ και ἁπλοτητι, δηλωσαι ὑμιν ελπιζει μκ ἡ ψυχη τῳ επιθυμια μκ μη παραλελοιπεναι με τι των ανηκοντων ὑμιν εις σωτηριαν, ενεστωτων.* Cap. 17. [e] *Ερωτω υμας χαριν αιτκμενος. κ. λ.* Cap. 21.

[f] *Διο μαλλον εσπευδασα γραψαι, αφ' ων ηδυνηθην, εις το ευφραναι υμας.* Ibid.

which Barnabas seems to have been distinguished: but we do not discern here the dignity and authority of an apostle.

Consequently, this epistle may afford edification, and may be read with that view. But it ought not to be esteemed by us, as it was not by the ancients, a part of the rule of faith.

CHAP. III.

Of the method in which the Canon of the New Testament has been formed.

THE canon of the New Testament is a collection of books, written by several persons, in several places, and at different times. It is, therefore, reasonable to think, that it was formed gradually. At the rise of the christian religion there were no written systems or records of it. It was first taught and confirmed by Christ himself in his most glorious ministry; and was still farther confirmed by his willing death, and his resurrection from the dead, and ascension to heaven: afterwards it was taught by word of mouth, and propagated by the preaching of his apostles and their companions. Nor was it fit, that any books should be written about it, till there were converts to receive and keep them, and deliver them to others.

If St. Paul's two epistles to the Thessalonians were the first written books of the New Testament, and not written till the year 51, or 52, about twenty years after our Saviour's ascension, they would be for a while the only sacred books of the new dispensation.

As the christians at Thessalonica had received the doctrine taught by Paul, "not as the word of men, but, as it is in truth, the word of God," 1 Thess. ii. 13, they would receive his epistles, as the written word of God. And himself taught them so to do, requiring, that they should be solemnly "read unto all the holy brethren," 1 Thess. v. 27. He gives a like direction, but more extensive, at the end of his epistle to the Colossians, iv. 16, requiring them, after they had read it "amongst themselves, to cause it to be read also in the church of the Laodiceans: and that they likewise read the epistle, that would come to them from Laodicea."

All the apostle Paul's epistles, whether to churches or particular persons, would be received with the like respect by those to whom they were sent, even as the written word of God, or sacred scriptures: and in like manner the writings of all the apostles and evangelists.

They who received them would, as there were opportunities, convey them to others. They who received them were fully assured of their genuineness by those who delivered them. And before the end of the first century, yea, not very long after the middle of it, it is likely, there were collections made of the four gospels, and most of the other books of the New Testament, which were in the hands of a good number of churches and persons.

From the quotations of Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and other writers of the second century, of Origen in the third, and of Eusebius in the fourth century, it appears, that the greatest part of the books, which are now received by us, and are called canonical, were universally acknowledged in their times, and had been so acknowledged by the elders and churches of former times. And the rest now received by us, though they were then doubted of, or controverted by some, were[a] well known, and approved by many. And Athanasius, who lived not long after Eusebius, (having flourished from the year 326 and afterwards,) received all the same books which are now received by us, and no other. Which has also been the prevailing sentiment ever since.

This canon was not determined by the authority of councils: but the books, of which it consists, were known to be the genuine writings of the apostles and evangelists, in the same way and manner that we know the works of Cæsar, Cicero, Virgil, Horace, Tacitus, to be theirs. And the canon has been formed upon the ground of an unanimous, or generally concurring testimony and tradition.

In the course of this long work we have had frequent occasion to observe, that the canon of the New Testament had not been settled by any authority universally acknowledged, particularly not in the time of[b] Eusebius, nor of [c] Augustine, nor of [d] Cosmas, nor of [e] Cassiodorius: but that nevertheless there was a general agreement among christians upon this head.

That the number of books to be received as sacred and canonical had not been determined by the authority of any

[a] See Eusebius, Vol. iv. p. 86, 87.
[b] Ibid. p. 100, 101.
[c] Ibid. p. 111.
[d] Vol. v. p. 99.
[e] Ibid. p. 112.

council, or councils, universally acknowledged, is apparent from the different judgments among christians, in several parts of the world, concerning divers books, particularly the epistle to the Hebrews, and the Revelation: which were received by some, rejected or doubted of by others: not now to mention any of the catholic epistles. There was no catalogue of the books of scripture in any canon of the council of Nice. Augustine[f] giving directions to inquisitive persons, how they might determine what books are canonical, and what not, refers not to the decisions of any councils. Cassiodorius, in the sixth century, has[g] three catalogues, one called Jerom's, another Augustine's, another that of the ancient version: but he refers not to the decree of any council, as decisive. And it seems to me that in all times, christian people and churches have had a liberty to judge for themselves according to evidence. And the evidence of the genuineness of most of the books of the New Testament has been so clear and manifest, that they have been universally received.

The genuineness of these books, as before said, is known in the same way with others, by testimony or tradition. The first testimony is that of those who were cotemporary with the writers of them: which testimony has been handed down to others.

That in this way the primitive christians formed their judgment concerning the books proposed to be received as sacred scriptures, appears from their remaining works. Says Clement of Alexandria: 'This[h] we have not in the 'four gospels, which have been delivered to us, but in that 'according to the Egyptians.' Tertullian may be seen largely to this purpose, Vol. ii. p. 273—277. I pass on to Origen, who says: 'As[i] I have learned by tradition con-'cerning the four gospels, which alone are received without 'dispute by the whole church of God under heaven.' So Eusebius, in his Ecclesiastical History, often observes, what books of the New Testament had been quoted by the ancients and what not. And having rehearsed a catalogue of books universally received, and of others controverted, he says: 'It[k] was needful to put down these also; distin-'guishing the scriptures, which according to ecclesiastical 'tradition are true, genuine, and universally acknowledged, 'from those which are controverted, and yet appear to have 'been known to many: that by this means we may know

[f] See Note [c].
[g] Ibid. p. 110, 111.
[h] Vol. ii. p. 236.
[i] Ibid. p. 494.
[k] Vol. iv. p. 97, &c.

'them from such as have been published by heretics, under 'the names of apostles. Which books none of the eccle sias- 'tical writers in the succession from the times of the apos- 'tles have vouchsafed to mention in their writings.' I may not transcribe, but only refer to[l] Athanasius in his Festal Epistle, to[m] Cyril of Jerusalem,[n] Rufinus, and [o] Augustine.

However, beside observing the testimony of writers in former times, they criticised the books which were proposed to them: examining their style and contents, and comparing them with those books, which had been already received as genuine upon the ground of an unanimous testimony, and undoubted tradition. Says honest Serapion, bishop of Antioch, in an epistle to some, who had too much respect for a writing, entitled the Gospel of Peter: 'We,[p] 'brethren, receive Peter, and the other apostles, as Christ; but 'as skilful men, we reject those writings, which are falsely 'ascribed to them: well knowing, that we have received 'no such.' And he adds, that upon perusing that work, he had found the main part of it agreeable to the right doctrine of our Saviour: but there were some other things of a different kind. And Eusebius adds in the place transcribed above: 'The[q] style also of these books is entirely different 'from that of the apostles. Moreover the sentiments and 'doctrine of these writings differ from the true orthodox 'christianity. All which things plainly show, that they are 'the forgeries of heretics.'

It has been sometimes said, that the council of Laodicea first settled the canon of the New Testament. But it may be justly said to have been settled before. At least, there had been long before a general agreement among christians, what books were canonical, and what not; what were the genuine writings of apostles and evangelists, and what not. From the decree of the council itself it appears, that there were writings already known by the title of canonical. That council does nothing in their last canon, but declare, 'That[r] private psalms ought not to be read in the 'church, nor any books not canonical, but only the canoni- 'cal books of the Old and New Testament.' After which follows a catalogue or enumeration of such books. The same may be said of the third council of Carthage, whose forty-seventh canon is to this purpose: 'Moreover[s] it is

[l] P. 154, 155.
[m] P. 172, 173.
[n] P. 483, 484.
[o] P. 492, 493.
[p] Vol. ii. p. 264.
[q] Vol. iv. p. 97.
[r] P. 182.
[s] P. 486.

'ordained, that nothing beside the canonical scriptures be 'read in the church, under the name of divine scriptures.'

I shall now transcribe below a long and fine passage of Mr. Le Clerc, wherein he says: 'We[t] no where read of a 'council of the apostles, or of any assembly of the gover- 'nors of christian churches, convened, to determine by their 'authority, that such a number of gospels, neither more 'nor fewer, should be received. Nor was there any need 'of it, since it is well known to all from the concurring 'testimony of contemporaries, that these four gospels are the 'genuine writings of those whose names they bear: and 'since it is also manifest, that there is in them nothing un- 'worthy of those to whom they are ascribed, nor any thing 'at all contrary to the revelation of the Old Testament, nor 'to right reason. There was no need of a synod of gram- 'marians, to declare magisterially what are the works of 'Cicero, or Virgil—In like manner the authority of the 'gospels has been established by general and perpetual 'consent, without any decree of the governors of the church. 'We may say the same of the apostolical epistles, which 'owe all their authority, not to the decisions of any ecclesi- 'astical assembly, but to the concurring testimony of all 'christians, and the things themselves, which are contained 'in them.'

Mr. James Basnage[u] has several chapters, showing how the canon of the New Testament was formed, without the authoritative decisions of councils. I likewise refer to[v] Mr. Jones upon this subject. I must also remind my readers

[t] Nusquam quidem legimus, collegium apostolicum, aut cœtum ullum rectorum ecclesiarum christianarum coactum esse, qui pro auctoritate definierint hunc numerum evangeliorum esse admittendum, non majorem, nec minorem. Sed nec opus fuit, cum omnibus constaret, ex testimonio et consensu æqualium, quatuor hæc evangelia eorum vere fuisse, quorum nomina præferunt; cumque nihil in iis legatur quod scriptoribus dignum non sit, vel revelationi Veteris Testamenti, rectæve rationi, vel minimum adversetur; aut quod inferius ævum, recentiorumque manus ullo modo recipiat. Non opus fuit synodo grammaticorum, qui, pro imperio, pronuntiarent ea scripta, verbi causâ Ciceronis et Virgilii, quæ eorum esse non dubitamus, re verâ tantorum ingeniorum fetas fuisse, et posteritati eâ in re consulerent. Omnium consensus, non quæsitus, non rogatus, sed sponte significatus, prout occasio tulit, resque ipsæ omnibus, qui postea vixere, dubitationem omnem anteverterunt—Sic et evangeliorum auctoritas merito constituta est, et invaluit, perpetuo consensu, sine ullo rectorum ecclesiæ decreto.

Idem dixerimus de epistolis apostolicis, quæ nullius ecclesiastici conventûs judicio, sed constanti omnium christianorum testimonio, rebusque ipsis, quas complectuntur, auctoritatem omnem suam debent. Cleric. H. E. ann. 100. num. iii. iv. Vid. et ann. 29. num. xcii.

[u] Hist. de l'Eglise, l. 8. ch. v. vi. vii.

[v] New and full Method, Part I. ch. v. vi. vii.

of[w] Augustine's excellent observations, in his arguments with the Manichees, concerning the genuineness and integrity of the books of the New Testament. I shall transcribe from him here a few lines only, which are very much to the present purpose. 'We[x] know the writings of the 'apostles, says he, as we know the words of Plato, Aristo-'tle, Cicero, Varro, and others; and as we know the writ-'ings of divers ecclesiastical authors: forasmuch as they 'have the testimony of cotemporaries, and of those who 'have lived in succeeding ages.'

Upon the whole, the writings of the apostles and evangelists are received, as the works of other eminent men of antiquity are, upon the ground of general consent and testimony. Nor does the canon of the scriptures of the New Testament owe its establishment to the decisions of councils: but it is the judgment of christian people in general: and so far as we are able to perceive, after a long and careful examination, it is a right and reasonable judgment. And it may induce us to believe, that if men were encouraged to think freely, in other matters also, and to judge for themselves, according to evidence, and proper assistances were afforded them, it would not be at all detrimental to the interests either of truth or virtue.

CHAP. IV.

OF THE TIME OF WRITING THE GOSPELS, ESPECIALLY THE FIRST THREE.

SECT. I.

That the Gospels are not mentioned, nor referred to, in the Epistles of the New Testament.

EUSEBIUS intimates, that[a] many before him supposed, that when Paul in his epistle speaks of his own gospel, he

[w] See Vol. iii. p. 422—424. [x] Ib. p. 423, 424.

[a] Φασι δε, ὡς αρα τ8 κατ' αυτον ευαγγελι8 μνημονευειν ὁ Παυλος ειωθει, ὁπηνικα ὡς περι ἰδι8 τινος ευαγγελι8 γραφων ελεγε, κατα το ευαγγελιον μ8. Eus. H. E. l. 3. c. 4. p. 73. D.

intended the gospel according to Luke. We will therefore consider those texts, and some others of a like kind.

I. St. Paul says, Rom. ii. 16—"in the day, when God shall judge the secrets of men, according to my gospel." The same phrase occurs again, ch. xvi. 25; and 2 Tim. ii. 8, "Remember, that Jesus Christ, of the seed of David, was raised from the dead, according to my gospel." In all which places, I apprehend, it must be reasonable to understand, not any written gospel, or history of Jesus Christ: but the doctrine of the gospel of Jesus Christ, which had been preached by Paul. Which is also the opinion of learned modern interpreters in general.

II. 2 Cor. viii. 18, "And we have sent with him the brother, whose praise is in the gospel, throughout all the churches." Many have been of opinion, that St. Luke is the brother here intended, and that St. Paul refers to Luke's written gospel. This[b] is said to be Origen's interpretation; but I do not clearly perceive it. Origen,[c] speaking of the four gospels, says: 'The[d] third is that accord-'ing to Luke, the gospel commended by Paul.' I say, I do not perceive it to be clear, that Origen had an eye to 2 Cor. viii. 18. He might intend Rom. ii. 16, or xvi. 25, or 2 Tim. ii. 8. However, whether it be Origen's interpretation of that text or not, it is Jerom's; who, writing the history of St. Luke in his book of Illustrious Men, says: 'He[e] wrote a gospel of which Paul makes mention, 'saying: "And we have sent with him the brother, whose 'praise is in the gospel."' To the same purpose[f] also in the prologue to his Commentary upon St. Matthew: and likewise in[g] his Commentary upon the epistle to Philemon.

Chrysostom upon the place speaks after this manner. 'And[h] who is this brother? Some say, Luke: and think, 'that the apostle refers to the history written by him. 'Others say Barnabas. For by gospel he intends unwritten

[b] 'Who this brother was, is much contested. Antiquity has carried it for 'St. Luke, worthy of praise in all the churches for the gospel which he wrote. 'The authority of this assertion seems to rest upon the words of Origen, the 'interpolated Ignatius, and St. Jerom.' So Whitby upon the place.

[c] *Και τριτον το κατα Λυκαν, το ὑπο Παυλε επαινεμενον ευαγγελιον.* Ap. Eus. l. 6. cap. 25. p. 226. C.

[d] See Vol. ii. p. 494.

[e] See Vol. iv. ch. cxiv. num. vii. I.

[f] Ib. num. viii. 3.

[g] De quo [Lucâ] et in alio loco; Misi, inquit, cum illo fratrem, cujus laus est in evangelio per omnes ecclesias—&c. In Philem. T. IV. P. I. p. 454.

[h] *Και τις ετος εστιν ὁ αδελφος; τινες μεν τον Λυκαν. Και φασι, δια την ἱστοριαν ἡνπερ εγραψε. Τινες δε τον Βαρναβαν. Και γαρ το αγραφον κηρυγμα ευαγγελιον καλει.* In 2 Epist. ad Corinth. hom. 18. tom. X.

'preaching.' Theophylact[i] speaks to the like purpose. Theodoret[k] by the brother understood Barnabas: and therefore could not think of any written gospel, no such work having been ascribed to him by the ancients. Œcumenius's note is to this purpose. 'Many[l] say, this brother is Luke, mentioned upon account of the gospel composed by him. Many others suppose him to be Barnabas: for, as they say, unwritten preaching is here called 'gospel; which is the more likely: for what follows is 'more suitable to Barnabas: "whose praise is in the 'gospel." As much as to say, he not only preaches, but 'commendably.' And afterwards. 'The meaning is, he 'not only evangelizeth, and preacheth the gospel admirably, and commendably, but he has been chosen to travel 'with us, with this grace also.' Such are the sentiments of the ancients upon this text.

Let us now observe the interpretations of some judicious moderns.

Grotius says: 'He[m] does not dislike the opinion of those, 'who think Luke to be here intended: but he does not 'think, that St. Paul refers to his book of the gospel, which 'was not then published: but to the office of an evangelist, which Luke had discharged in several places, or 'to his preaching the gospel. And he says, that *in* the 'gospel may be the same as *by* the gospel. So in ch. x. '14, of the same epistle.'

Estius likewise says, that[n] by gospel is to be understood preaching: not St. Luke's gospel, which we are not certain was then published.

Le Clerc, in his French Testament, translates in this manner: "One of our brethren, who is praised on account of the gospel in all the churches." And in his notes says, 'that generally St. Luke is here supposed to be intended: 'though St. Paul refers rather to his preaching the gospel, 'than to the book of his gospel.'

Beausobre translates after this manner: "one of the

[i] In loc. p. 389.

[k] Τον τρισμακαριον Βαρναβαν τα ειρημενα χαρακτηριζει. Theod. in loc. T. III. p. 243.

[l] Œcum. in loc. Tom. I. p. 663.

[m] Mihi non displicet sententia illorum, qui hic Lucam designari putant: ita tamen ut per evangelium non intelligatur liber, qui tunc editus nondum erat, sed ipsum munus evangelistæ, quod Lucas Pauli vice multis in locis fideliter obierat, sive ipsa evangelii prædicatio, ut infra, x. 14. εν 'in,' pro δια 'per.' Grot. ad 2 Cor. viii. 18.

[n] Neque enim Paulus de evangelio scripto loquitur, sed, quo modo passim alibi, de evangelio prædicato. Deinde nec satis constat, evangelium Lucæ tum editum fuisse, quando Paulus hanc epistolam scripsit. Est. in loc.

brethren, who has made himself famous in all the churches by [preaching] the gospel." And says in his notes: 'that 'though some of the ancients have hereby understood St. 'Luke, and his gospel; he thinks, that by the gospel is 'here intended the preaching of the gospel. Besides, there 'is no proof, that St. Luke had as yet written his gospel: 'it is rather reasonable to think, he had not.'

Upon the whole, though we cannot certainly say, who is the brother, whose praise was in the gospel: whether[o] Luke, or Barnabas, or Silas, or Apollos: I presume we are sufficiently warranted to say, that by gospel is here intended neither the gospel according to Luke, nor any other written gospel whatever.

III. 1 Tim. vi. 20, "O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust." Hereby some have been disposed to understand a written gospel: but they are not favoured by the best interpreters. Grotius says, that[p] this deposit, or thing committed to Timothy's trust, is the sacred doctrine of the gospel. Estius says[q] the same. I place below likewise[r] a part of Beza's note upon this text. Le Clerc in his notes explains it thus: 'The doctrine of the 'gospel, which was a sacred deposit, committed by the 'apostles to their disciples.' And Beausobre thus: 'The 'doctrine, which had been committed to, or entrusted with 'Timothy.' See also, says he, 1 Tim. i. 18, and 2 Tim. ii. 2. I say no more to this text.

IV. 2 Tim. i. 13, 14, "Hold fast the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me—That good thing, which was committed unto thee, keep by the Holy Ghost, which dwelleth in us."

Hereby some may understand a written gospel, or history of Jesus Christ. Nevertheless, I think, I need not add much here to what has been already said of the preceding text, it being nearly parallel. The meaning of both is much the same. Timothy is here again exhorted, and required, to retain with all fidelity those sound words, that pure doctrine of the gospel, which he had been taught by the apostle, and had often heard from him.

[o] Vid. Est. in 2 Cor. viii. 18. et Beausobr. in ver. 18, et 23.

[p] Vocat autem depositum sacram doctrinam evangelii, quia et res est alterius, nempe Christi, et pastoribus fida ejus custodia incumbit. Grot. ad 1 Tim. vi. 20.

[q] Iterum serio et graviter admonet, ut acceptam fidei doctrinam conservet, ne locum relinquat ulli peregrino dogmati. Nomine depositi metaphorice significatur doctrina successori credita ac per manus tradita. Est. in loc.

[r] Depositum proculdubio vocat sanam evangelii doctrinam, et dona quæcumque ad ecclesiæ ædificationem, veluti depositum, Deus commiserat Timotheo. Bez. in loc.

It does not appear, then, that there are in the apostolical epistles of the New Testament, any references to written gospels, or histories of Jesus Christ. I do not say this is a proof, that no such histories were then written. Nevertheless, I have thought it not improper to show, that there is no notice taken of any such histories in these epistles: and therefore they cannot afford any evidence of their being then written and published. I think likewise, that it was not amiss to embrace this occasion to show the true meaning of some texts, which have been often misinterpreted.

SECT. II.

Observations of ancient christian writers, leading to the true time when the gospels were written.

1. SAYS Irenæus, as formerly [a] quoted, 'For [b] we have not 'received the knowledge of the way of our salvation from 'any others, than those, by whom the gospel has been 'brought to us: which gospel they first preached, and af- 'terwards by the will of God committed to writing, that 'for time to come it might be the foundation and pillar of 'our faith. Nor may any say, that they preached before 'they had a complete knowledge of the doctrine of the 'gospel. For after that our Lord rose from the dead, and 'they [the apostles] were endowed from above with the 'power of the Holy Ghost coming down upon them, they 'received a perfect knowledge of all things. They then 'went forth to all the ends of the earth, declaring to men 'the blessing of heavenly peace, having all of them, and 'every one alike, the gospel of God.'

He then proceeds to speak of the gospels of the four evangelists severally, and the times and occasions of writ-

[a] See Vol. ii. p. 169.

[b] Non enim per alios dispositionem salutis nostræ cognovimus, quam per eos, per quos evangelium pervenit ad nos: quod quidem tunc præconiaverunt, postea vero per Dei voluntatem in scripturis nobis tradiderunt, fundamentum et columnam fidei nostræ futurum. Nec enim fas est dicere, quoniam ante prædicaverunt, quam perfectam haberent agnitionem, sicut quidam audent dicere, gloriantes, emendatores se esse apostolorum. Postea enim quam surrexit Dominus noster a mortuis, et induti sunt supervenientis Spiritûs Sancti virtutem ex alto, de omnibus adimpleti sunt, et habuerant perfectam agnitionem, exierunt in fines terræ, ea quæ a Deo nobis bona sunt evangelizantes, et cœlestem pacem hominibus annunciantes; qui quidem et omnes pariter et singuli eorum habentes evangelium Dei—Iren. Adv. Hær. l. 3. cap. 1.

ing them. All which will be taken down by us hereafter in proper places. Here is sufficient to induce us to think, that the written gospels, or histories of Jesus Christ, were not published till some good while after our Lord's ascension. For the apostles first preached, he says, before they wrote.

2. Says Eusebius in a long passage formerly quoted: 'Those[c] admirable and truly divine men, the apostles of 'Christ,——neither knew, nor attempted, to deliver the 'doctrine of their Master with the artifice and eloquence of 'words—Nor were they greatly concerned about the writ-'ing of books, being engaged in a more excellent ministry, 'which is above all human power. Insomuch, that Paul, 'the most able of all in the furniture both of words and 'thoughts, has left nothing in writing, beside a few epistles. '—Nor were the rest of our Saviour's followers unacquaint-'ed with these things, as the seventy disciples, and many 'others, besides the twelve apostles. Nevertheless of all the 'disciples of our Lord, Matthew and John only have left 'us any memoirs: who too, as we have been informed, 'were compelled to write by a kind of necessity.' And what follows.

3. This passage should be compared with another of[d] Origen: and they who please may also consult our remarks[e] upon what has been now transcribed from Eusebius. Which may be of use to caution us, not to be too precipitate in giving a very early date to the gospels, as if they were written immediately after our Lord's ascension: when there is no reason to think, they were not written, till after numerous converts had been made, who expressed their desires to have written histories of what they had heard, for refreshing their memories.

4. Says Theodore, bishop of Mopsuestia, in the latter part of the fourth century, about the year 394. 'After[f] 'the Lord's ascension to heaven the disciples stayed a good 'while at Jerusalem, visiting the cities in its neighbour-'hood, preaching chiefly to the Jews: until the great 'Paul, called by the divine grace, was appointed to preach 'the gospel to Gentiles openly. And in process of time 'Divine Providence, not allowing them to be confined 'to any one part of the earth, made way for conducting 'them to remote countries: Peter went to Rome, the others 'elsewhere. John in particular took up his abode at 'Ephesus, visiting, however, at seasons, the several parts of

[c] Vol. iv. p. 95.
[c] Vol. iv. p. 109—115.
[d] Vol. ii. p. 494.
[f] Ib. p. 398.

'Asia—About this time the other evangelists, Matthew, 'Mark, and Luke, published their gospels, which were 'soon spread all over the world, and were received by all 'the faithful in general with great regard.'——He proceeds to say, 'that nevertheless, the christians in Asia, having 'brought those gospels to him, earnestly entreated him to 'write a farther account of such things as were needful to 'be known, and had been omitted by the rest: with which 'request he complied.'

This remarkable passage, upon which divers observations were made when it was first quoted, may dispose us to think, that all the four gospels were written about the same time, and that none of them were published till after, or about the sixtieth year of our Lord's nativity.

5. By divers ancient christian writers it is said that[g] Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, at the desire of the brethren of Rome, wrote a short gospel, according to what he had heard related by Peter. So Jerom,[h] beside others, as before quoted in his book of Illustrious Men.

St. Peter, I reckon, did not come to Rome before the reign of Nero, probably, not till the second time that Paul was in that city, in the year 63, or 64. And yet, at this time, the christians at Rome desired Mark to give them in writing an account of Peter's preaching, for refreshing their memories concerning what the apostle had said of Christ, and his doctrine. The consequence is manifest. They had not then any written gospel in their hands; nor did they know that there was one. 'The truth is,' says Mr. Jones,[i] 'if St. Mark, or any one else, had had St. Matthew's gos-'pel, at Rome, there would have been no need of St. Mark's 'writing.'

These are general observations in the ancients, or deduced from them, which may be of no small use to lead us to the true time of writing the first three gospels.

[g] See Vol. ii. p. 121, 122, 225—232. Vol. iv. p. 188, &c.
[h] Vol. iv. ch. cxiv. num. viii. 2.
[i] Vindication of the former Part of St. Matthew's Gospel, p. 54. ch. vi.

SECT. III.

That the first three gospels were published before the destruction of Jerusalem, which happened in the year of the christian epoch LXX.

CONCERNING this I transcribe below [a] a very good argument of Le Clerc, from his dissertation upon the four evangelists.

The Jewish war began, according [b] to Josephus, in the month of May, in the 66th year of the christian epoch, and ended in September, in the year 70, in the desolation of the city of Jerusalem, and the temple. And I think, it may be shown to be very probable, that the first three gospels were written before the year 66, when the final troubles and calamities of the Jewish people were coming on.

This must appear to have a great deal of probability, from the predictions therein recorded concerning the destruction of the temple, the overthrow of the city of Jerusalem, the ruin of the Jewish state and people in Judea, together with divers circumstances of these events, and many troubles and calamities preceding them. These predictions are recorded in his histories of our Saviour's ministry, which we call gospels, without any the least hint, either express and designed, or accidentally dropping from the writers, that those predictions had been fulfilled and verified, or that the things spoken of had happened. Those prophecies are recorded in Matt. xxiii. 34—39, and xxiv. Mark xiii. Luke xxi. St. Luke has also elsewhere recorded the affectionate concern which our Lord expressed in the view

[a] Quinetiam, si ex veterum nonnullorum testimoniis antea adductis, de re judicemus, affirmabimus Matthæum, Marcum, et Lucam ante ultima Neronis tempora, quibus occisi sunt Petrus et Paulus, evangelia scripsisse. Quod non levi argumento confirmari potest, ducto ex Matt. cap. xxiv. Marc. xiii. Luc. xxi. ubi narratur Jerosolymæ excidii prædictio, quasi rei etiamnum futuræ eo tempore, quo evangelia ab iis scribebantur. Si enim eam prædicationem post eventum scripsissent evangelistæ memorati, verbulo saltem monuissent, prædictionem fuisse eventu confirmatam. Quod tantum abest ut faciant, ut Matthæus et Marcus hac admonitione, *ὁ αναγινωσκων νοειτω, qui legit, intelligat,* quam subjiciunt præsagiis Jerosolymitanæ cladis, admonere videantur christianos in Judæâ viventes, ut diligenter futura illa præsagia attendant, quo possint vitæ suæ consulere. Vide Matt. xxiv. 15. Marc. xiii. 14. et ad ea loca interpretes. Cleric. Diss. iii. de quatuor evangeliis. num. vii. p. 541.

[b] Vid. Joseph. Antiq. Jud. l. 20. cap. xi. n. c. &c. B. i. l. 6. cap. x.

and prospect of those impending evils, ch. xiii. 34, 35, and xix. 41—44. These things are also referred to, and spoken of, in divers other discourses, some plain, some parabolical, or otherwise figurative: as Matt. xxi. 33—46; xxii. 1—7; Mark xii. 1—12; Luke xiii. 1—9; xx. 9—20; xxi. 5—13. In none of all which places does there appear any intimation that the things spoken of were come to pass, and in recording the presages of this final and total overthrow of the Jewish nation, the historians have inserted warnings and admonitions, proper to excite the attention of readers, and induce those who lived in Judea, to take care of their own safety without delay. Matt. xxiv. 15—18, "When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place; (whoso readeth let him understand;) then let them which be in Judea flee into the mountains. Let him which is on the house-top not come down to take any thing out of his house. Neither let him which is in the field return back to take his clothes." And what follows. And to the like purpose in Mark xiii. 14—16. When these discourses were recorded, the things spoken of had not yet come to pass. There were men living to whom these admonitions might be useful for securing their safety.

Moreover, though these predictions must have been recorded, before they were accomplished, I think the fulfilment was then near at hand, and not far off. This seems to be implied in that expression: "Let him that readeth, understand." And indeed it must have been difficult and hazardous to publish such things in writing. How offensive these sayings must have been to the Jewish people, and perhaps to some others likewise, is easy to conceive from the nature of the things spoken of: and it may be confirmed by divers instances. When our Lord had spoken the parable of the vineyard, let out to husbandmen, recorded in Luke xx. 9—18, it is added by the evangelist, ver. 19, 20. "And the chief priests, and the scribes, the same hour sought to lay hands on him, but they feared the people; for they perceived, that he had spoken this parable against them. And they watched him, and sent forth spies, which should feign themselves just men, that they might take hold of his words, that so they might deliver him unto the power and authority of the governor." And among the odious charges brought against our Saviour by false witnesses, this was one, "that he said: I am able to destroy the temple of God, and to build it in three days," Matt. xxvi. 61. With this he was reproached likewise, when

hanging on the cross, ch. xxvii. 40. The like offensive charges were brought against Stephen. Acts vi. 14, "We have heard him say, that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place, and shall change the customs which Moses delivered to us." And, possibly, he did say somewhat not very different. So likewise St. Matthew, and the other apostles, might repeat in the hearing of many what Christ had said to them, and in part to others also, concerning the overthrow of the temple, and the Jewish state: yea, very probably, they had often repeated these things to attentive hearers. But speaking and writing are different; and I apprehend it could not have been safe, nor prudent, to record these predictions (many of which are very plain, and all intelligible) soon after our Lord's ascension.

These prophecies therefore of our Lord, as recorded in the first three gospels, afford at once an argument, that they were written and published before the destruction of Jerusalem: and that they were not published many years before it, or, however, not many years before the commencement of the war at the time above mentioned.

SECT. IV.

An argument showing the true time of writing the Gospels, taken from the Acts, and the beginning of St. Luke's gospel.

NONE can suppose that the book of the Acts of the Apostles was composed before the year 62, or 63, as the history is there brought down to the period of St. Paul's two years' imprisonment at Rome.

And, very probably, the gospel, to which St. Luke refers at the beginning of that book, had not been written long before. This I suppose to be now the common opinion of learned men. And for giving the greatest satisfaction to all my readers, I shall transcribe below at large the sentiments of several to this purpose, such as that of the late [a] Mr.

[a] 'Hence we see near to what time this history of the Acts was written: 'viz. either in the year 62, or not long after; it being altogether probable, 'that St. Luke would not defer writing long after his departure from St. Paul; 'which seems to have been now, when the apostle was set at liberty from 'his confinement at Rome.—That he wrote both the gospel and the Acts in 'the same year, seems very probable; as it is certain, that one of them 'is only to be looked upon as the second part, or continuation of the

Jones, and [b] Estius, [c] Mill, [d] Dodwell, and [e] Basnage; though the thing appears to me very obvious: and if so, we have gained very nearly the date of one of the four gospels.

Grotius supposeth, that [f] when Paul left Rome, he went into Spain: and that at the same time Luke went into Greece, and there wrote both his gospel and the Acts. Jerom supposeth, that [g] the book of the Acts was written at Rome. But that makes no difference in point of time; since he allows, that it reaches to the end of St. Paul's two years' imprisonment at Rome.

This one consideration, so far as I am able to judge, overthrows the opinion, that St. Luke's gospel was written about fifteen years after our Lord's ascension. Yea, it evidently shows, that it was not written till the year 60, or afterwards.

And the beginning of St. Luke's gospel affords an argument, that the other two gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark were not written sooner: for this evangelist knew nothing of them. Consequently, they were not then written and published, or but lately; every word of his introduction shows this: let us observe it.

"Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us.——It seemed good unto me also, having had perfect understanding of all things, from the very

'other.' Jones' New and Full Method, &c. Part. iv. ch. xvi. vol. iii. p. 158. See him also, ch. xi. p. 115.

[b] Deinde, nec satis constat, evangelium Lucæ jam tum editum fuisse, quando Paulus hanc epistolam scripsit. Nam Acta quidem Apostolica scripsisse videtur statim post evangelium, tanquam ejusdem voluminis libros primum et secundum. Scripsit autem Acta post biennium Pauli Romæ commorantis, id est, multis annis post hanc epistolam. Quare circa idem tempus evangelium ab eo scriptum fuisse, credibile est. Est. ad 2 Cor. viii. 18.

[c] Voluminis hujus D. Lucæ partem posteriorem, seu λογον δευτερον quod attinet, librum dico Actuum Apostolorum, haud dubium est——quin is scriptus sit statim post λογον πρωτον, sive evangelium. Mill. Prol. num. 121.

[d] Sunt enim Acta δευτερος ejusdem operis λογος, cujus πρωτον λογον ipse suum agnoscit evangelium. Act. i. 1. Dodw. Diss. Iren. i. num. xxxix.

[e] Non multum vero interjectum fuisse temporis inter Actorum Apostolicorum et evangelii confectionem conjectura ex præfatione ad Theophilum duci potest. 'Primum quidem librum confeci'—Actuum ergo liber continuatio est, seriesque evangelii.—Multum vero abiise temporis antequam a priore libro omnibus numeris expleto ad posteriorem transiret Lucas nullâ ratione cogimur ad credendum, &c. Basnag. Ann. 60. num. xxviii.

[f] Librum autem et hunc, et qui de Actibus Apostolorum, scriptum arbitror, non multo postquam Paulus Româ abiit in Hispaniam. Nam in id tempus desinit Actuum liber, qui si serius scriptus esset, in ulteriora etiam tempora narrationem protenderet. Puto autem, Româ iisse Lucam in Achaiam, atque ibi ab eo conscriptos quos habemus libros. Grot. Pr. in Evang. Lucæ.

[g] See Vol. iv. ch. cxiv. num. viii. 3.

first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus: That thou mightest know the certainty of those things, wherein thou hast been instructed."

When St. Luke says, that many had undertaken to write histories of our Saviour, he cannot mean Matthew alone, nor Matthew and Mark only, for they are not many. He must intend them, and others, or some different from them: which last will appear most likely, if we consider what there follows.

Of those many he says, they 'had taken in hand,' undertaken, or attempted. St. Luke would not have spoken thus of Matthew or Mark. Indeed, we may suppose, that [h] those narrations, to which St. Luke refers, were not false and fabulous, nor heretical: but they were defective.

Grotius says, the [i] word is of a middle meaning; and that it does not necessarily imply, that the writers, here intended, had failed to perform what they undertook.

Nevertheless the ancient christians, to several of whom the Greek language was natural, understood the word differently. And their judgments must be of value in this case. Origen's observations upon St. Luke's introduction may be seen, Vol. ii. ch. xxxviii. num. xxiv. 1. where he says, 'St. Luke's expression, "taken in hand," implies a tacit accusation of those, who, without the gift of the Holy Ghost, 'took upon them to write gospels. For Matthew, and Mark, 'and Luke, and John, did not take in hand to write: but, being full of the Holy Ghost, wrote gospels.' In which words, and afterwards, continually, he distinguisheth the four evangelists from the writers referred to by St. Luke. To the like purpose [k] Ambrose, who either copied, or closely imitated Origen. And says Eusebius, 'Luke [l] at the beginning assigns the reason of his writing, declaring, that 'whereas many others had rashly undertaken to compose 'relations of the things which were most firmly believed, 'he therefore thought himself obliged, in order to divert

[h] Quod istos ait Lucas, non satis commode præstitisse; minime tamen, opinor, fabulosas, imo etiam impias narrationes intelligens, tandem ecclesiæ, sub Nicodemi,—Thomæ, Ægyptiorum nominibus impudentissime obtrusas. Nec tamen hic recte colligunt, Lucam post Matthæum et Marcum hanc suam historiam edidisse. Bez. in Luc. cap. i. ver. 1.

[i] Επεχειρησαν, 'aggressi sunt.' Bene notavit vir eruditissimus, vocem esse mediam: neque enim ex eâ colligi posse non præstitum ab illis scriptoribus quod aggressi sunt. Grot. in loc.

[k] See Vol. iv. ch. cvi. num. iii.

[l] —— δηλων ως αρα πολλων και αλλων προπετεστερον επιτηδευκοτων διηγησιν ποιησασθαι, ών αυτος πεπληροφορητω λογων, κ. λ. Euseb. l. 3. c. 24. p. 96. C.

'us from the uncertain relations of others, to deliver in his 'gospel a certain account of those things, of which he was 'fully assured.' Which passage was transcribed by us [m] formerly. And Epiphanius, whom [n] I now place below, plainly affixed a disadvantageous meaning to this word.

Beausobre readily allows, that [o] we ought to follow the ancients in their interpretation of this word, and to suppose that St. Luke here speaks of some attempts, and essays, that had not been well executed.

This may be sufficient to satisfy us, that St. Luke does not speak of any of our evangelists. Mr. [p] Dodwell was of the same opinion.

But we may have yet farther assurance of it by observing what St. Luke says of himself, and his own design; which is to this purpose, 'That it had seemed good to him to send 'to Theophilus in writing a distinct and particular history 'of Jesus Christ: that he might better know, and be more 'fully confirmed in the truth of those things, in which he 'had been instructed by word of mouth.'

In my opinion this implies a supposition, that Theophilus had not yet in his hands any good written history of the words and works of Jesus Christ.

Consequently St. Luke at the year 62, and possibly somewhat later, did not know of St. Matthew's and St. Mark's gospels: and therefore we must suppose that they were not yet written and published, or however but lately. For if they had been published several years, St. Luke, who had accompanied Paul in Greece, Asia, Palestine, and Rome, could not have been unacquainted with them.

This argument appears to me valid: at least I cannot discern where it fails. It has long seemed to me a clear and obvious argument, that the gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark were not written till the year 60, or afterwards. For if they had been written sooner, they would by this time have been in the hands of St. Luke and Theophilus, and all

[m] Vol. iv. p. 96.

[n] ———φασκων, επειδηπερ πολλοι επεχειρησαν· ἱνα τινας επιχειρητας δειξῃ· φημι δε τους περι Κηρινθον, και Μηρινθον, και τους αλλους. H. 51. num. vii. p. 428.

[o] Ce mot Grec, επεχειρησαν, est certainment très équivoque, et peut fort bien signifier 'des tentatives malheureuses, des efforts qui ont mal réussi.' St. Epiphane ne l'a pas entendu autrement. Origène de même, dans sa préface sur S. Luc, et après lui la plupart des interprêtes Grecs. Quand il s'agit de la signification des termes Grecs, et que les auteurs Grecs, qui les expliquent, n'ont aucun intérêt à leur donner des sens forcés, ces derniers semblent dignes de créance. Beaus. Remarques sur Luc. ch. i. p. 100.

[p] Ut plane alios fuisse necesse sit evangelicæ historiæ scriptores a Lucâ visos, a nostris, quos habemus evangelistis. Diss. Iren. i. num. xxxix.

the faithful in general: and St. Luke could not have expressed himself as he does in this introduction; nor indeed would he have written any gospel at all.

CHAP. V.

ST. MATTHEW, APOSTLE AND EVANGELIST.

I. *His History.* II. *Testimonies of ancient writers to his gospel.* III. *Remarks upon them, for discerning the time of this Gospel.* IV. *Characters of time in the Gospel itself.* V. *The language in which it was written.*

I. MATTHEW,[a] called also[b] Levi, son of[c] Alpheus, was a publican, or[d] toll-gatherer under the Romans. He was,

[a] The history of our Lord's calling this disciple is in Matt. ix. 9—13; Mark ii. 13—16; Luke v. 27—32.

[b] This evangelist, in his account of his being called by Christ, names himself Matthew, ch. ix. 9. But St. Mark and St. Luke in their accounts of it call him Levi, Mark ii. 14; Luke v. 27, 29. This has induced Grotius to argue, that Matthew and Levi are different persons: though he cannot deny, that the circumstances of the history lead us to think, one and the same person to be intended. Video omnes hodie ita existimare, hunc eundem esse quem Marcus et Lucas Levi nominant. Et sane congruunt circumstantiæ. Grot. ad Matt. ix. 9. It is observable, that Heracleon, the Valentinian, as cited by Clement of A. Str. l. 4. p. 502, reckons among apostles, who had not suffered martyrdom, Matthew, Philip, Thomas, and Levi. By Levi, probably, Heracleon meant Lebbeus, otherwise called Thaddeus. Vide Fabr. Bib. Gr. l. 4. cap. 5. T. III. p. 126. Coteler. Annot. in Constitut. l. 8. cap. 22. Dodw. Diss. Iren. i. n. 24. It is certain, that Eusebius and Jerom thought Matthew and Levi to be only two names of one and the same person. See in this work, Vol. iv. p. 91, 92, 439, 441. Moreover in the catalogues of the apostles which are in Mark iii. 18; Luke vi. 15; Acts i. 13, is the name Matthew. It is likely, that Levi was the name by which the apostle was called in the former part of his life; and Matthew the name by which he was best known afterwards.

[c] That is said by St. Mark only, ch. ii. 14. But we do not perceive who Alphæus was. Tillemont observes to this purpose, 'St Mark gives him the 'surname of Alphæus: τον τȣ Αλφαιȣ. Which may have been the name of 'his father. This has given occasion to some of the ancients, and to all the 'modern Greeks, to say, that James the son of Alphæus, was his brother: 'though it be entirely destitute of all probability. Quoiqu'il il n'y ait en 'cela aucune apparence.' Tillem. S. Matt. init. Mem. T. I.

Dr. Doddridge, Family Expositor, sect. 44. Vol. I. p. 280, says roundly, 'that Matthew, otherwise called Levi, was the son of Alphæus, and the brother

undoubtedly a native of Galilee, as the rest of Christ's apostles were: but of what city in that country, or of which tribe of the people of Israel, is not known.

As he sat at the receipt of custom, by the sea-side, in the city of Capernaum, or near it, "Jesus said unto him; Follow me: and he arose and followed him." Which needs not to be understood to imply, that Matthew did not make up his accounts with those, by whom he had been employed and entrusted.

Afterwards[e] he made an entertainment at his house, where Jesus was present, and likewise divers of his disciples. And there sat at table with them many publicans, and others, of no very reputable character in the eye of the pharisees, who were strict in external purifications, and other like observances. Matthew, it is likely, was willing to take leave of his former acquaintance in a civil manner. He was likewise desirous that they should converse with Jesus, hoping that they might be taken with his discourse. And Jesus, with a view of doing good, and to show that he did not disdain any man, made no exceptions to this design of his new disciple. Nor is it unlikely, that the ends aimed at were obtained, in part at least. Matthew's former friends did probably discern somewhat extraordinary in Jesus, so far as to induce them to think it was not unrea-

'of James. Compare Mark iii. 18. Luke vi. 15. Acts i. 13.' But I do not think those texts can afford sufficient proof that Matthew, and James the son of Alphæus, had the same father, and were brothers. If that had been the case, their relation to each other would have been hinted, or plainly declared in the gospels.

I do not love bold conjectures in others, and would not indulge myself in them. But I suspect, that these words in Mark ii. 14, 'son of Alphæus,' τον τȣ Αλφαιȣ, are an interpolation, some how or other, undesignedly, and accidentally inserted in that place. What is truly said of James, has been also applied to Matthew. The curious may do well to consider, whether this conjecture be not countenanced by the singularity of the thing, said no where else, and by the various readings of that text, which may be seen in Beza, Mill, and Wetstein.

[d] 'His office seems more particularly to have consisted in gathering the 'customs of commodities, that came by the sea of Galilee, and the tribute, 'which passengers were to pay, that went by water.' Cave's Lives of the Apostles, p. 177.

[e] That this entertainment was not made by Matthew on the very day that Christ called him to attend on him, is argued by Mr. Jones in his Vindication of the former part of St. Matthew's Gospel, p. 129—137, and by Dr. Doddridge, Family Expositor, Vol. I. sect. LXXI. note[a]. who says, 'It is certain, 'the feast was after the day of his calling, perhaps some months after: when 'he had made up his accompts, and regularly passed his business into other 'hands: which, to be sure, from a principle of justice, as well as prudence, 'he would take care to do.'

sonable in him to leave his former employment, for the sake of the company of Jesus, and the advantages which in time he might receive from him. The pharisees made reflections: but our Lord vindicated himself. And all the three evangelists have recorded this instance of our Lord's amiable familiarity and condescension, which is one of the distinctions of his shining character. And it is a proof, that at the time of their writing, severally, their gospels, they were moulded into the temper and principles of him whose history they wrote.

Jesus now called Matthew to be with him, to be a witness of his words and works, and he put him into the number of his apostles. Thenceforward he continued with the Lord Jesus; and after his ascension he was at Jerusalem, and partook of the gift of the Holy Ghost, with the other apostles. Together with them he bore testimony to the resurrection of Jesus: and, as may be supposed, preached for some while at Jerusalem, and in the several parts of Judea, confirming his doctrine with miracles, which God enabled him to perform in the name of Jesus.

In his own catalogue of the twelve apostles, ch. x. he is the eighth in order. In St. Mark's, ch. iii. and St. Luke's, ch. vi. he is the seventh. He is also named in the eighth place, Acts i. 13. Nor is there any particular account in the gospels of the call of any of the apostles, except his and four others, Andrew and Peter, and the two sons of Zebedee, who were called before.[f]

Clement of Alexandria says, that[g] the apostle Matthew used a very sparing diet, eating no flesh, but only vegetables. But perhaps this is said upon the ground only of some uncertain tradition not well attested.

Socrates, in the fifth century, says, that[h] when the apostles went abroad to preach to the Gentiles, Thomas took Parthia for his lot, Matthew Ethiopia, and Bartholomew India. And it is now a common opinion, that Matthew[i] died a martyr in Ethiopia, in a city called Nadabbar, or Naddaver; but by what kind of death is altogether uncer-

[f] St. John says, ch. i. 43, "The day following, Jesus would go forth into Galilee, and findeth Philip, and saith unto him: Follow me." If Philip was then called by our Lord to be an apostle, he ought to be added to the others above named.

[g] *Ματθαιος μεν ων ὁ αποστολος σπερματων, και ακροδρυων, και λαχανων, ανευ κρεων, μετελαμβανεν.* Clem. Pæd. l. 2. p. 148. D.

[h] *Ἡνικα οἱ αποστολοι κληρῳ την εις τα εθνη πορειαν εποιουντο. Θωμας μεν την Παρθων αποστολην υπεδεχετο· Ματθαιος δε Αιθιοπιαν. κ. λ.* Socr. H. E. l. i. c. 19.

[i] See Cave's Lives of the Apostles, and his Hist. Lit.

tain. However, some others speak of his preaching and dying in Parthia or Persia: and the diversity of those accounts seems to show, that they all are without good foundation.

I think it may be of use to take here at length a passage of Eusebius, at the beginning of the third book of his Ecclesiastical History, after having in the preceding book spoken of the many calamities in Judea, when the war was just breaking out. 'This,' says he, 'was the state of things 'with the Jews. But the holy apostles and disciples of our 'Saviour, being dispersed abroad, preached in the whole 'world. Thomas, as we learn by tradition, had Parthia for 'his lot: Andrew, Scythia; John, Asia, who having lived 'there a long time died at Ephesus. Peter, as it seems, 'preached to the dispersed Jews in Pontus, and Galatia, 'Bithynia, Cappadocia, and Asia: at length coming to 'Rome, he was crucified, with his head downward, as he 'had desired. What need I to speak of Paul, who fully 'preached the gospel of Christ from Jerusalem to Illyri-'cum, and at last died a martyr at Rome, in the time of 'Nero? So says Origen expressly in the third tome of his 'expositions of the book of Genesis.'

Thus writes our ecclesiastical historian. But, as Valesius observes, it [k] is not easy to determine exactly where the quotation from Origen begins.

However, from this passage, as it seems, we may conclude, that at the beginning of the fourth century, there were not any certain and well attested accounts of the places out of Judea, in which many of the apostles of Christ preached: for if there had, Eusebius must have been acquainted with them. In particular, we may hence infer, as I apprehend, that there was no certain account, whither Matthew went when he left Judea; for there is no notice taken of him in this passage. Nor does Jerom in his article of St. Matthew, in his book of Illustrious Men, formerly [l] transcribed at large, take any notice of the countries in which he preached: nor do I recollect, that in any other of his genuine works he has said any thing of the travels of this apostle.

Heracleon, a learned Valentinian, in the second century, as cited by Clement of Alexandria, reckons [m] Matthew

[k] Cum Eusebius hic dicat superiora ex libro tertio Explanationum Origenis in Genesim esse desumpta, dubitari merito potest, unde incipiant Origenis verba, &c. Vales. Annot. in l. 3 cap. 1.

[l] Vol. iv. ch. cxiv. num viii. 1.

[m] Ου γαρ παντες οἱ σωζομενοι ὡμολογησαν την δια της φωνης ὁμολογιαν, και εξηλθον· εξ ὡν Ματθαιος, Φιλιππος, Θωμας, Λευις, και αλλοι πολλοι. Clem. Stir. l. 4. p. 502. B.

among those apostles, who did not die by martyrdom; nor does Clement contradict him.

It is also observable, that[n] Chrysostom has a commendation of Matthew, consisting of divers articles: his humility; mercifulness or liberality; piety; general benevolence; writing a gospel; finally, fortitude, inasmuch as "he came from the presence of the council rejoicing:" referring, I suppose, to Acts v. 41: but says nothing of his martyrdom. Which may induce us to think, that there was not any tradition about it among christians at that time, or that it was not much regarded.

II. Having thus given the history of this apostle, I proceed to the consideration of his gospel, one of the universally acknowledged books of the new Testament. Two things principally are to be the subjects of our inquiry, the time of writing it, and the language in which it was written. And I propose to recite here briefly all, or most of the authors, that have been largely quoted in the former volumes, so far as relates to those two particulars.

Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, about A. D. 116, by some supposed to have been acquainted with John the apostle, by others with John the elder only, in his five books, entitled, Explications of the Oracles of the Lord, which seem to have been collections of ancient stories and traditions, makes[o] express mention of Matthew's gospel, and says that he wrote the Divine Oracles in the Hebrew tongue.

Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, about the year 178, who was born in Asia, and in his youth was acquainted with Polycarp, disciple of St. John, says, 'Matthew,[p] then among 'the Jews, wrote a gospel in their own language, while 'Peter and Paul were preaching the gospel at Rome, and 'founding [or establishing] the church there. And after 'their exit, [that is, death, or departure,] Mark also, the 'disciple and interpreter of Peter, delivered to us in writ-'ing, the things that had been preached by Peter. And 'Luke, the companion of Paul, put down in a book the 'gospel preached by him. Afterwards John, the disciple 'of the Lord, who leaned upon his breast, likewise pub-'lished a gospel, whilst he dwelt at Ephesus in Asia.' In

[n] In Matt. Hom. 48. [al. 49.] T. VII. p. 491.

[o] See of this work, Vol. ii. p. 119.

[p] Ὁ μεν δε Ματθαιος εν τοις Ἑβραιοις τη αυτων διαλεκτῳ και γραφην εξενεγκεν εναγγελια, τε Πετρε, και τε Παυλε εν Ῥωμη εναγγελιζομενων και θεμελιουντων την εκκλησιαν. κ. λ. Adv. Hær. l 3. cap. i. Et ap. Euseb. l. 5. c. 8. And in this work, Vol. ii. p. 170.

another place he says, 'the [q] gospel according to Matthew was delivered to the Jews.'

Origen, about 230, says, 'that[r] according to the tradition 'received by him, the first gospel was written by Mat-'thew, once a publican, afterwards a disciple of Jesus 'Christ: who delivered it to the Jewish believers, com-'posed in the Hebrew language.' And in another place he says, 'that[s] Matthew wrote for the Hebrews.'

Says Eusebius, about 315, 'Matthew[t] having first 'preached to the Hebrews, when he was about to go to 'other people, delivered to them in their own language the 'gospel according to him, by that writing supplying the 'want of his presence with those whom he was leav-'ing.'

Athanasius, in his Festal Epistle,[u] does not say where, or in what language Matthew wrote. But in the Synopsis ascribed to him, it is said, 'that[v] Matthew wrote his gos-'pel in Hebrew, and published it at Jerusalem.'

Cyril of Jerusalem says, 'that[w] Matthew wrote in He-'brew.'

Epiphanius likewise says, 'that[x] Matthew wrote in He-'brew.' And afterwards. 'Matthew[y] wrote first, and 'Mark soon after him, being a follower of Peter at Rome.' If Mark did not write till after Peter came to Rome, and Matthew but a little before him; it follows, that Matthew's gospel was not written so soon as many later writers have supposed.

Gregory Nazianzen in his catalogue says, 'that[z] Mat-'thew wrote for the Hebrews.'

And Ebedjesu, 'that[a] Matthew, the first evangelist, pub-'lished his gospel in Palestine, written in Hebrew.'

Theodore of Mopsuestia, says, 'that[b] for a good while 'the apostles preached chiefly to Jews in Judea. After-'wards Providence made way for conducting them to re-'mote countries. Peter went to Rome, the rest elsewhere: 'John, in particular, took up his abode at Ephesus—About 'this time the other evangelists, Matthew, Mark, and Luke, 'published their gospels, which were soon spread all over the 'world.' This supposeth a late date of the gospels, as was argued, Vol. iv. ch. cxiii. num. iii. 2, that is, after the beginning

[q] Vol. ii. p. 171. [r] Ib. p. 494. [s] P. 515.
[t] Vol. iv. p. 95, 133. [u] P. 155. [v] P. 165.
[w] P. 173. [x] P. 188.
[y] Ευθυς δε μετα τον Ματθαιον ακολουθος γενομενος ὁ Μαρκος τῳ ἁγιῳ Πετρῳ εν Ρωμῃ. Citat. ib. p. 305.
[z] See Vol. iv. p. 287. [a] P. 321. [b] P. 398.

of Nero's reign, when Peter went to Rome, and not long before the war in Judea, which broke out in 66, about which time John left that country, and settled at Ephesus.

Says Jerom in the prologue to his Commentary upon St. Matthew: 'The[c] first evangelist is Matthew, the publi-'can, surnamed Levi, who wrote his gospel in Judea, in the 'Hebrew language, chiefly for the sake of the Jews that be-'lieved in Jesus, and did not join the shadow of the law 'with the truth of the gospel.' To the like purpose in the article of St. Matthew, in his book of Ecclesiastical Writers: 'Matthew,[d] called also Levi, of a publican made an apostle, 'first of all wrote a gospel in Judea in the Hebrew lan-'guage, for the sake of those of the circumcision, who be-'lieved. Who afterwards translated it into Greek, is un-'certain.'

Chrysostom in the introduction to his homilies upon this gospel: 'Matthew[e] is said to have written his gospel at 'the request of the Jewish believers, who desired him to 'put down in writing what he had taught them by word of 'mouth: and he is said to have written in Hebrew.' He speaks with hesitation, and is not positive about the occasion of writing this gospel, or the language in which it was written. Afterwards he says: 'In[f] what place 'each one of the evangelists wrote, cannot be said with 'certainty.'

Cosmas of Alexandria, about the year 535, says: 'Mat-'thew[g] is the first evangelist that wrote a gospel. There 'being a persecution, when Stephen was stoned, and he 'also being about to go from that place, the believers en-'treated him to leave with them a written instruction, with 'which request he complied.' And what follows.

The author of the Imperfect Work upon St. Matthew, in the sixth century, about the year 560, observes to this purpose: 'The[h] occasion of Matthew's writing is said to be 'this. There being a great persecution in Palestine, so 'that there was danger, lest all the faithful should be dis-'persed: that they might not be without teaching, though 'they should have no teachers, they requested Matthew to 'write for them a history of all Christ's words and works, that 'wherever they should be, they should have with them the 'ground of their faith.' This writer does not say, that this was the persecution that arose about the time of the death of Stephen. He seems to speak of a later, and more

[c] P. 439.
[d] P. 441.
[e] P. 538.
[f] P. 539.
[g] Vol. v. p. 94.
[h] P. 119, 120.

general persecution and dispersion, such as may be well supposed to have been in Judea, near the war in 66; when most, or all of the apostles, and many of the Jewish believers, removed, and were dispersed into other countries.

In the Paschal Chronicle, a work composed in the seventh century, as formerly cited, it is intimated, that [i] St. Matthew published his gospel in Palestine, about fifteen years after our Lord's ascension, and soon after the council at Jerusalem, of which an account is given Acts xv.

And to draw to a conclusion of this list of writers. Theophylact, in the eleventh century, says: 'Matthew 'then [k] first wrote a gospel in the Hebrew language, for 'the sake of the Hebrew believers, eight years after our 'Saviour's ascension.'

Euthymius in the beginning of the twelfth century: 'That [l] Matthew's gospel was the first, and written in Ju-'dea, in Hebrew for the Jewish believers, eight years after 'our Lord's ascension.'

Nicephorus Callisti, in the fourteenth century, says: 'Matthew [m] having preached the saving word to the Jews, 'when he was about to go abroad to the Gentiles, thought 'it best to write in his native language an account of his 'preaching, to supply the want of his presence; which 'he did at about fifteen years after our Saviour's as-'cension.'

III. Who now of all these writers deserves the greatest regard? Irenæus, I think, as being the most ancient. And with him agree Epiphanius, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and the author of the Imperfect Work, as it seems. Nor is he contradicted by Eusebius of Cæsarea, so far as I can perceive: [n] he says, 'that when Matthew was about to go to 'other people, he delivered his gospel to the Hebrews in 'their own language.' But he does not say in his Ecclesiastical History, nor any where else, when this apostle left Judea. Some [o] may have understood him to mean about eight years after our Saviour's ascension, and others about fifteen years after it, as Nicephorus and perhaps the Paschal Chronicle; but himself has not expressly mentioned the time: and he may have been undetermined in his mind about the time when Matthew left Judea. Moreover, he has inserted [p] in his Ecclesiastical History the passage of Irenæus above quoted, upon which we insist. And a late

[i] See vol. iv. p. 133.
[k] Vol. v. p. 158, 159.
[l] P. 166.
[m] P. 168, 169.
[n] Vol. iv. p. 133.
[o] P. 132—134.
[p] L. 5. cap. 8. p. 172. l.

date of the gospels is agreeable to his own, and others' observations, before taken notice of, that the apostles of Christ did not write many books, and were not very forward to write but as they were compelled by a kind of necessity.

There are divers learned moderns of good judgment in these matters, who pay a great regard to this testimony of Irenæus, particularly, [q] Fabricius, [r] Mill,[s] S. Basnage, and before them [t] Martin Chemnitius.

Mill supposed it to be highly probable, that [u] Irenæus had this account from Papias. Le Clerc [v] likewise seems to have thought, that Irenæus found this in the five books of Papias: but that is only conjecture. Eusebius quoting Papias observes, that he said, Matthew wrote in Hebrew. But he does not say, that Papias mentioned the time of writing his gospel. However, it was the opinion of Irenæus; and it may be reckoned not improbable, that he had a tradition to that purpose, which he relied upon as right, for he speaks of it without hesitation. It might be derived from several, one of whom was Papias.

Irenæus says, that 'Matthew published his gospel when 'Peter and Paul were preaching at Rome:' that is, says [w] Mill, in the year 61. 'For,' adds he, 'I understand him of the first time that Paul was at Rome:' But if Irenæus says right, it must have been at the second time that Paul was at Rome; for we have no reason to believe that Peter was at all in that city when Paul was sent thither by Festus: but, very probably, Peter and Paul were there together afterwards, and suffered martyrdom there about the same time. That is the season to which we should be led for fixing the writing of St. Matthew's Gospel, if Irenæus may be relied upon. Accordingly Basnage [x] in his annals

[q] De tempore, quando scripserit, cui potius fidem habeamus, quam S. Irenæo, temporibus illis proximo, qui tradit eum edidisse evangelium, τε Πετρε και τε Παυλε εν Ῥωμῃ ευαγγελιζομενων και θεμελιεντων την εκκλησιαν. Bib. Gr. l. 4. c. 5. T. 3. p. 126.

[r] Prolegom. num. 61. [s] A. 64. n. xii.

[t] Examen Concil. Trid. p. 16.

[u] Tamen Irenæus l. 3. c. i. expresse dicit, (ex auctoritate Papiæ, nullus dubito, qui παραδοσιν hanc a Johanne presbytero, apostolorum familiari, acceperat,) Matthæum evangelium suum edidisse, 'cum Petrus et Paulus evangelizarent Romæ, et fundarent ecclesiam.' Proleg. num. 61.

[v] Vid. Diss. de iv. Evang. sub init.

[w] Atque hoc ipso quidem anno LXI. prodiisse videtur evangelium Matthæi —Ego quidem de priori adventu intelligendum Irenæum omnino arbitror. Ib. num. 61, 62.

[x] Quo tempore Petrus Paulusque Romæ operam dabant evangelio, Matthæus, si creditur Irenæo, evangelium exaravit suum—Annum tamen perinde

speaks of St. Matthew's Gospel, at the year 64. And though, as he says, he does not know the year, nor the place, where St. Matthew's gospel was published, yet he expresseth himself, as if he were inclined to think it was not written till Nero's reign was somewhat advanced, in the year 64 or 65, the time of that emperor's persecution of the christians.

Other learned men are for an earlier date: whose opinions also, undoubtedly, ought to be taken notice of, and considered by us.

Cave thought that [y] St. Matthew's gospel was written about the fifteenth year after our Saviour's ascension, in the year 48, a short time before the council of Jerusalem, or soon after it.

Baronius was of opinion, that [z] this gospel was published in the year 41, soon after that Peter had begun to preach to Gentiles, at the house of Cornelius in Cæsarea.

Grotius [a] and G. I. Vossius [b] were likewise of opinion, that St. Matthew's gospel was written about eight years after Christ's ascension.

Tillemont argues, 'That [c] St. Matthew wrote his gospel 'about three years after the crucifixion of Christ; for it 'must have been written before the apostles left Judea. 'The time of their going abroad, as he owns, is uncertain: 'but it must have been about the year 36, forasmuch as it 'appears, that in the year 37, when Paul came to Jerusalem,

atque locum, ubi a Matthæo conditum est, in incerto esse, facile patimur—Nos nonnisi Neronè rerum domino editum fuisse, persuasum habemus, etsi de anno locove divinare non possumus. Nulla tamen se magis veri specie commendat chronologia, quam illa Irenæi; quod nempe Paulo et Petro Romanos instituentibus, scribendo Matthæus operam dederit: ut ecclesiæ aliquid monumenti esset, quo obortum ex persecutione Neronis dolorem leniret, sanctorumque apostolorum eo fluctu oppressorum faciem in evangelio videre sibi videretur ecclesia. Basn. Ann. 64. n. xii.

[y] Scripsisse evangelium suum viii. a Christi resurrectione anno vulgo dicitur. Quod tamen ad annum a Christi assumtione 15 referunt auctor Chr. A. et Nicephorus. Et sane eum ante annum a passione Christi 12, apostolis Judææ finibus egredi non licuit, vix ante ann. 15. Chr. 48. finitâ synodo Hierosolymitanâ, ad suam quisque sortem abierunt, adeo ut paulo ante Matthæus evangelium suum condidisse videtur. H. L. in Matthæo, p. 13.

[z] Baron. Ann. 41. num. ix. xvi.

[a] Grot. Pr. ad Matth. [b] Si quidem Matthæus in Palæstinâ scribebat, idque intra proximum a passione Christi octennium. Voss. de Gen. J. C. cap. iv. sect. 2.

[c] Il semble même nécessaire de dire, que S. Matthieu a écrit trois ans seulement après la mort de J. C—Le temps de cette division des apôtres est incertain. Il semble néanmoins, que ç'a été vers l'an 36; puisqu'il paroît, qu'il n'y avoit aucun apôtre à Jérusalem, lorsque S. Paul vint an 37, hors S. Pierre, et S. Jacque le mineur. S. Matthieu. Mem. T. I.

'there were no other apostles there beside Peter, and James 'the Less.' But that argument is of no value. For the apostles might be all at Jerusalem, or in its neighbourhood, though Paul saw none, beside the two just mentioned.

Mr. Jones earnestly contends, that[d] this gospel was written eight years after our Lord's ascension, in the year 41. But I do not think it needful to take any farther notice of his arguments, than has been done[e] already.

Mr. Wetstein has lately declared in favour of the same opinion. 'And[f] hence, says he, we discern the reason why 'this evangelist has inserted so many discourses about the 'Jewish superstitions: which could be of little or no use to 'other people, and among other nations, when the temple 'was once destroyed, or was near being destroyed.' But I am not able to discern any force in that way of reasoning, because I perceive not any superfluities in this, or any of the evangelists. Our Lord's reproofs of Jewish superstitions, his declarations of the superiority of moral virtue, or righteousness and true holiness, above the righteousness of the scribes and pharisees, his censures of the pride and covetousness, false maxims, and hypocritical conduct of the same men, will be useful to all people so long as the world stands. As our Lord was a Jew, and his ministry was employed among those people in Judea; it is no wonder, that in his discourses, recorded by St. Matthew, whenever he wrote, there should be frequent allusions to their laws, customs, and worship. The like[g] are in the other

[d] New and Full Method, &c. Vol. III. ch. v. p. 59, 64.

[e] See vol. iv. p. 133—135.

[f] Magno consensu perhibent Patres, Matthæum in gratiam credentium ex Judæis in Palæstinâ evangelium suum exscripsisse, et quidem, ut multi addunt, Hierosolymis, octavo post ascensionem Christi anno, qui Claudii Imperatoris primus fuit. Cur illorum testimonium in dubium vocetur, causam non video: quin istâ hypothesi admissâ, plurima non infeliciter existimo explicari posse, quorum aliter ratio vix invenitur. Hinc enim intelligimus, cur Matthæus primum in ordine evangelistarum occupet locum, quia nimirum primus omnium scripsit: cur item tam multas de Judæorum superstitionibus referat disputationes, quibus apud alias nationes, vel templo jam everso, vel paulo post evertendo, locus vix fuisset. Wetst. N. T. Tom. I. p. 223.

[g] When Mr. Wetstein speaks of the many discourses about Jewish superstitions, which are in St. Matthew's gospel, I imagine he may particularly refer to Matt. xxiii. 1—30. Nevertheless divers of those things occur also in the gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke. See Mark xii. 38—40. Luke xi. 42—52. and xx. 46, 47. And both Mark viii. 14—21, and Luke xii. 1, 2, have recorded our Lord's injunctions, 'to beware of the leaven of the pharisees and sadducees, or Herodians,' as well as Matthew xvi. 6—12. Not now to mention any other like things.

two first evangelists: and in St. John's gospel the last of the four are as long discourses with the cavilling Jews, as in any of the rest.

I therefore readily assent to those who think that this gospel was written in the time of the Emperor Nero, not till about thirty years after our Saviour's ascension. I am not able to assign the year in which it was written; but I am somewhat inclined to the year 63, 64, or 65, of the vulgar epoch. This is agreeable not only to the testimony of Irenæus, and some other ancients, but to the circumstances of things. At the year 64, or thereabout, the gospel had been propagated in many Gentile countries, the times were troublesome in Judea, and the war was coming on: several of the apostles were dead, others of them, who survived, were gone, or going abroad, and many of the Jewish believers were about to seek shelter elsewhere: now was a proper time to write a history of Christ and his miracles. Moreover in this gospel are recorded divers plain predictions of the miseries and desolations of Jerusalem, and the overthrow of the temple, and the Jewish state, beside many other figurative intimations of the same things in many of our Lord's discourses and parables. Which could not be well published to all the world in writing, till about this time. The suitableness of St. Matthew's gospel to the state of the christian religion, and of the Jewish people, about the year 64, or 65, leads to that time. And however unwillingly, from private apprehensions and prejudices, we may admit the thought of protracting so long the writing the history of our Lord's ministry, the circumstances of things will constrain us to acquiesce in this season, as the most likely.

IV. This leads me now to observe some characters of time in the gospel itself.

It was well known, and allowed by all, that[h] for a while our Lord's disciples laboured under Jewish prejudices: and that they did not fully understand all his discourses at the time when they were spoken. They did not, they could not, clearly discern the comprehensive design of the evangelical dispensation, till after Peter had been at the house of Cornelius, and there received into the church Gentile converts, without circumcision: nor till after the gospel had been preached abroad in foreign countries by Paul, and other apostles and ministers. Let us therefore now observe the book itself of St. Matthew, and

[h] There are many proofs of this in the gospels. See particularly John xvi. 7.—14, and likewise the history in the Acts, ch. x.

see what knowledge he appears to have had of the scheme of the gospel.

1. His account of the commission which our Lord gave to the twelve apostles is in ch. xxviii. 19. "Go ye therefore into all the world, and teach all nations." Matthew did not then think that the apostles of Jesus were to teach Jews only, but that they were required to teach all people, and all nations in general.

2. I suppose that he fully understood our Lord's doctrine, when he recorded that summary account of it which is in the fifth, sixth, and seventh chapters of his gospel. The beatitudes at the beginning are a proof of it. And at the conclusion, they who "heard and did those sayings," are compared to "a man that built his house upon a rock;" though there had been nothing said to enforce the rituals of the Mosaic law.

3. And that he well understood the spirituality and the freedom of the gospel, appears from what he has recorded, ch. xv. 10—20.

4. His clear discernment of the design of the gospel dispensation appears even in his account of our Saviour's nativity, particularly in what he says, ch. i. 21, of the message of the angel to Joseph. "And thou shalt call his name Jesus. For he shall save his people from their sins."

5. If he had not known that our Saviour was designed to be, or was already become, a blessing to Gentiles, he would scarcely have thought of inserting the history of the Magi coming from the east to Jerusalem, to inquire after the birth of the King of the Jews, chap. ii.

6. It is also very likely, that he understood those words of John the Baptist, recorded by him, ch. iii. 9, "God is able of these stones to raise up children to Abraham."

7. St. Matthew's knowledge of the calling of the Gentiles and the rejection of the Jews, may be concluded from many things recorded by him. In the history of our Lord's healing the centurion's servant at Capernaum he inserts our Lord's commendation of his faith, and that declaration: "Many shall come from the east and the west, and sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven: but the children of the kingdom shall be cast out," ch. viii. 10—12.

8. The admission of the Gentiles to equal privileges with the Jews must be intimated in the parable of the labourers hired into the vineyard at several hours of the day, ch. xx. 1—16.

9. The calling and acceptance of the Gentiles, and the

rejection of the Jewish people, and even their overthrow are plainly declared in the parable of the vineyard let out to husbandmen, and the discourse which follows, ch. xxi. 33—46. The same things are intimated in the parable of the king that made a wedding feast for his son, which is at the beginning of the next chapter, ch. xxii. 1—14.

10. I might likewise take notice of the history of our Lord's curing the daughter of the woman of Canaan, ch. xv. 21—28.

11. It is also very likely that St. Matthew had some good knowledge, and a distinct apprehension of the extent of our Lord's kingdom, and the progress of his doctrine, when he recorded those parables in the thirteenth chapter of his gospel: where our Lord has compared the kingdom of heaven, or the preaching of his gospel, to a grain of mustard-seed, the least of all seeds, but becomes a tree: to leaven, by which a large lump is leavened: to a net, that was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind. And, explaining the parable of the tares, our Lord says, ver. 37, 38, "He that soweth the good seed is the son of man. The field is the world." And what follows.

12. It is probable, that this evangelist had some knowledge of the gospel having been preached out of Judea, when he put down that declaration of our Lord concerning the woman, that poured the rich ointment upon his head: "Wheresoever the gospel shall be preached in the whole world, there shall this also, that this woman has done, be told for a memorial of her," ch. xxvi. 13.

13. In his account of the institution of the eucharist, ch. xxvi. 28. our Lord says: "This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many," that is, for all men, "for the remission of sins." And in ch. xx. 28, our Lord says: "The Son of man came—to give his life a ransom for many."

14. There is also an expression used by him once or twice, intimating, that it was some considerable space since the time of the event and his writing about it. Ch. xxviii. 8, "Wherefore that field was called the field of blood to this day." Having related the affair of the soldiers, and the directions given to them by the Jewish council to say, that "his disciples came by night, and stole him away," he adds: "And this saying is commonly reported among the Jews until this day," ver. 15. Such an expression does not denote any certain period: but one would think, that, in this case, thereby must be intended a considerable space of time, more than eight, or ten, or fifteen years.

15. I formerly[i] showed divers advantages of the late publication of the gospels. The life of Jesus could not be forgotten in thirty or forty years. His life and death were very public, as well as very extraordinary. His resurrection and ascension were most publicly attested by his apostles, and others, as we know from the book of the Acts. And from that time forward there were many, who were continually speaking of the things said and done by him, and of the evidences of his resurrection and exaltation. They were soon known to multitudes of people, small and great, and men of all ranks and characters. As St. Paul says to Festus, in a very great assembly, Acts xxvi. 26, "For the king knoweth of these things, before whom also I speak freely: for I am persuaded, that none of these things are hidden from him: for this thing was not done in a corner." And was it not the cry at Thessalonica? Acts xvii. 6, "These that have turned the world upside down, are come hither also." The account of St. Paul's manner of living at Rome, about the years 61 and 62, is, that "he dwelt two whole years in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him,—teaching those things, which concern the Lord Jesus Christ," Acts xxviii. 30, 31. Whilst there were men, who at the hazard of their lives taught, and others that embraced, the things concerning the Lord Jesus, they could not be forgotten. And if about thirty years after our Lord's ascension, his history was written by eye-witnesses, or their companions, it was soon enough: yea, it was the fittest time of all. At the year sixty of our Lord's nativity, according to the vulgar æra, and later, there certainly were enough such persons, as those just mentioned, still living, to record his words and works, and more, who were willing and desirous to read written histories of him, than before; and also more to transcribe and copy out those histories for their own use, and for the use and benefit of others, than in any preceding time.

V. It remains, that we consider in what language this gospel was written: because many of the ancients, whose testimonies have been lately recited, though they allow the other gospels to have been written in Greek, have delivered it as their opinion, that this gospel was written in Hebrew.

Of this I have already spoken several times, particularly, in the chapter of [k] Papias, and in the chapter of[l] Origen,

[i] See Vol. iv. p. 110—115.

[k] See Vol. ii. p. 120.

[l] Num. xxx.

and[m] of Eusebius and Cæsarea; where also the opinions of divers learned moderns were alleged, who think it was written in Greek. To them I now add[n] Le Clerc, who has an argument upon this head, proper to be consulted by those who have leisure, but too long to be inserted here: and his learned successor Mr. Wetstein, who says, 'Here[o] 'we are of opinion, that the fathers do not so properly 'bear testimony, as deliver their own conjecture: which 'needs not to be admitted, if it be not supported by good 'reasons, or may be refuted by probable arguments. Sup- 'posing, and taking it for granted, that Matthew wrote for 'the Jews in Judea, they concluded that he wrote in He- 'brew. But there is no weight in that reason. The Greek 'language was at that time much used throughout the 'whole Roman empire, and particularly in Judea. Pa- 'pias, who first advanced this opinion, was a weak and 'credulous man. Nor are there in our Greek gospel any 'marks of its being a translation from another language.'

Mr. Jones[p] has a long argument, well deserving to be read, showing, that this gospel was originally written in Greek.

Mr. Basnage[q] is of the same side, and has argued exceeding well for it: I should transcribe him if I had room; as I have not I refer to him.

Says[r] Dr. Jortin: "In the time of Christ and his apos- 'tles the Greek was really the universal language: the 'New Testament is a proof of it, if proof were wanting. 'And this is one reason amongst many others, why St. 'Matthew probably wrote his gospel in Greek.' See Wetstein's N. T. p. 224. St. Matthew, ch. v. 47, 48, says: "Οι τελωναι ουτω ποιουσιν. "Εσεσθε ουν υμεις τελειοι—that is, be

[m] Vol. iv. p. 137—139.

[n] Diss. iii. De iv. Evangeliis.

[o] Neque tam facile assentimur sententiæ eorundem patrum statuentium, Matthæum scripsisse Hebraïce, hoc est, Syriace, sive Chaldaïce, quâ linguâ tunc temporis Judæi in Palæstinâ utebantur—Existimamus enim patres hic jam non testimonium dicere, sed conjecturam suam in medium proferre, non admittendam, si aut idoneis rationibus non sit fulta, aut verisimilibus argumentis refutari possit. Quod enim putant necesse fuisse ut Hebræis scribens Hebraïce scriberet, verum non est; cum constet eo tempore linguam Græcam per totum imperium Romanum, et in Judæâ præsertim, in usu fuisse—Videntur ergo vetustissimi Patres, et inter eos Papias, homo simplex et credulus, re non exploratâ, inani Nazaræorum jactantiæ fidem habuisse—Nullum sane in nostro Matthæo reperitur indicium, unde colligi possit, ex aliâ in aliam linguam fuisse conversum. Plurima vero aliud suadent. Wetsten. N. T. tom. I. p. 224.

[p] See his Vindication of the former part of St. Matthew's gospel, ch. 17—19. p. 180—186.

[q] Ann. 64. n. xiii.

[r] See his Discourses concerning the Christian Religion, p. 176. note (o), the third edition.

not τελωναι, but τελειοι. Videtur autem Matthæus vocem τελειοι hic adhibuisse, ut τελωναις opponeret. Wetstein. Add to this, that τελωνης and τελειος are both derived from the same word, τελος. So again, ch. vi. 16, we find an antithesis in the words, αφανιζεσι τα προσωπα, οπως φανωσι. Eleganter dicitur: *Tegunt faciem, ut appareant, &c.* Wetstein.

And many others of the same sentiment might be mentioned, who are men of great learning and good judgment.

I shall now propose some observations relating to this point.

1. If St. Matthew did not write till about thirty years after our Lord's ascension, we must be led to think, he would use the Greek language. That he did not write sooner, I suppose to have been shown to be very probable. If indeed there were good reasons to think his gospel was written within the space of eight years after Christ's ascension, we might well conclude, that he wrote in Hebrew. But to me it seems, that we may be fully satisfied, that Matthew did not write within that space, nor so soon as fifteen years after our Lord's ascension, nor till some good while afterwards. St. James, residing at Jerusalem, writes an epistle about the year of Christ 60, as is supposed: it is addressed "to the twelve tribes scattered abroad;" and he writes in Greek, as is allowed. Why, then, should not St. Matthew use the same language?

2. There was very early a Greek gospel of St. Matthew. It is quoted or referred to by Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Polycarp, Justin Martyr, not now to mention any others: none of whom intimate, that they made use of a translation.

3. Though many of the ancients say, that St. Matthew wrote in Hebrew, they seem not to have fully believed it: for they have shown very little regard to the Hebrew edition of it. This has been particularly shown in the chapters of[s] Origen, [t] Eusebius of Cæsarea, and [u] Jerom, the most likely of any of the ancients to make use of that edition, if they had been persuaded that it was authentic and original.

4. There are not in our Greek gospel of St. Matthew, any marks of a translation: so said Mr. Wetstein in the passage just transcribed; and this observation was before made by us in the chapter of[v] Papias.

[s] Vol. iv. p. 574—576.
[t] Vol. iv. p. 137—140.
[u] Ibid. p. 477.
[v] Vol. ii. p. 120.

5. There is no where any probable account, who translated this gospel into Greek. No particular translator was mentioned by Papias, as may be concluded from the accounts given of his books by Eusebius. Nor is any translator of this gospel named by Irenæus, Eusebius, or any of the writers of the first three centuries, that are come down to us. Nor is there any reason to think, that he was named in any other: forasmuch as no notice is taken of him by Eusebius, or Jerom, who saw many writings of ancients now lost, both catholics and heretics. Jerom having said, that Matthew wrote in Hebrew, presently adds: 'Who [w] 'afterwards translated him into Greek, is uncertain.' And all the accounts of a translator, since given, are too late to be credited, and are likewise very improbable. In the Synopsis, ascribed to Athanasius, but not written till long after his time, it is said, 'That [x] Matthew's gospel was translated 'into Greek by James, the first bishop of Jerusalem.' Which is very improbable. It would be more reasonable to imagine, that he translated it out of Greek into Hebrew. But as that is not said by the ancients, so neither have we reason to say it. Moreover, the same reasons, as one may think, which would induce James to make a Greek translation, should have induced Matthew to write in Greek. Nevertheless Dr. Mill [y] has pitched upon that person for the translator, and formed an argument thereupon: which only serves to show, that there is nothing, for which something may not be said by those who indulge themselves in suppositions without ground. Theophylact informs us, that [z] in his time it was said, that John translated this gospel into Greek: but it was only a common report; and indeed it could be no more. However, out of a regard to such reports and testimonies, Mr Lampe [a] has very properly

[w] Vol. iv. ch. cxiv. num. viii. 1.

[x] Ibid. p. 165.

[y] Quis in Græcum transfuderit, incertum est. Papias de hoc nihil ab Aristione aut Joanne presbytero accepit, aut tradidit. Auctor Synopseos S. Scripturæ Jacobo fratri Domini diserte adscribit hanc versionem; Theophylactus, ex famâ duntaxat, Joanni evangelistæ. Ego ad priorem illam sententiam, ceu magis verisimilem, accedo. Satis enim probabile est, evangelium in Hebræorum usum linguâ ipsorum patriâ primum exaratum, ab ipsorum episcopo primario Jacobo, episcopo Hierosolymitano, in sermonem Græcum per provincias, in quas dispersi erant ex gente istâ plurimi, Judæis pariter ac aliis in usu familiari, translatum fuisse, &c. Proleg. num. 66.

[z] Μετεφρασε δε τουτο Ιωαννης απο της Εβραϊδος γλωττης εις την Ελληνιδα, ως λεγουσι. Theoph. Pr. in Matt. p. 2. D.

[a] Matthæi evangelium Græce a Joanne evangelistâ versum esse, refert Eutychius, tom. I. Annalium, p. 328. et Nicetas præfatione ad Catenam in Matthæum. Lampe, Prolegom. in Joan. l. i. cap. 7. num. 31.

reckoned a translation of this gospel among the works falsely ascribed to St. John.

6. Once more, I apprehend, we may discern the origin of this opinion, that St. Matthew's gospel was written in Hebrew. There was soon made a translation of his Greek gospel into Hebrew. We have seen proofs, that [b] in very early days of christianity there was a Hebrew gospel: and many, not examining it particularly, nor indeed being able to do it, for want of understanding the language, imagined that it was first written in Hebrew. Jerom expressly tells us, that [c] by many in his time the gospel according to the Hebrews was reckoned the true and authentic gospel of Matthew.

To this Hebrew translation of St. Matthew's gospel, possibly, are owing divers things said by the ancients: as that Matthew published his gospel at Jerusalem, or in Judea, for the Jewish believers, and at their request, before he went abroad to other people: I say, I do suspect the truth of these, and some other like things, said of St. Matthew, and his gospel: all which may have had their rise from the Hebrew edition of his gospel, which they imagined to be the original. For I think, that St. Matthew's, and all the other gospels, were written, and intended, for believers of all nations. His gospel was written for the Jews, but not for them only, but for Gentiles also: as manifestly appears from the gospel itself, or the things contained in it.

I am also ready to say, with [d] Mr. Basnage, that I do not know where it was published, whether in Judea, or somewhere else. But as I think the Nazarene gospel to be St. Matthew's gospel translated from Greek, with [e] the addition of some other things, taken from the other gospels, and from tradition: so I reckon, that the gospel of Matthew, written in Greek, was the gospel which came first into their

[b] See Vol. ii. p. 165.

[c] In evangelio, quo utuntur Nazareni et Ebionitæ, quod nuper in Græcum de Hebræo sermone transtulimus, et quod vocatur a plerisque Matthæi authenticum. Hier. in Matth. cap. xii. T. iv. P. i. p. 47.

In evangelio juxta Hebræos—quo utuntur usque hodie Nazareni, secundum apostolos, sive, ut plerique, juxta Matthæum. Adv. Pelag. l. 3. sub in T. iv. p. 533.

[d] Annum tamen perinde atque locum, ubi a Matthæo conditum est, in incerto esse, facile patimur. Ann. 64. num. xii.

[e] Distinguendum enim inter hoc evangelium, quale initio fuit, et illud, quale paullatim fiebat, Nazaræis varia addentibus—Primitus nihil habuit, nisi quod in Græco nunc legimus—Porro Nazaræi pluscula suis locis interseruerunt, quæ ab apostolis vel apostolicis viris fando accepissent. G. J. Voss. De Geneal. J. C. cap. ii. num. i.

hands, and which they gladly received, and made use of it. I say again, the notion of St. Matthew's writing in Hebrew, probably had its rise from the Hebrew edition of his gospel. For, allowing that date of his gospel which to me appears most probable, I cannot conceive the reason, why Matthew should write in Hebrew any more than any of the other evangelists. For it may be reckoned highly probable, or even certain, that he understood Greek, before he was called by Christ to be an apostle. Whilst a publican, he would have frequent occasions both to write and speak Greek; and could not discharge his office without understanding that language.

This Hebrew gospel may likewise have been the cause, why so many ancient christian writers say, that Matthew wrote first. This may be true: but I do not think it was said upon the ground of any certain knowledge, or good information. I apprehend it not to be easy to say, which gospel was first written, for all the first three gospels were written about the same time: and St. Luke's, for any thing that I know, may have been written first; which [f] was the opinion of Mr. Basnage.

CHAP. VI.

Of the time when the apostles left Judea to go and preach the gospel in other countries.

AS many ancient christian writers, whom we have lately quoted, say, that St. Matthew, having preached some while in Judea, was desired by the believers there to leave with them in writing, before he went away, a history of what he had taught by word of mouth: this may not be an improper place to inquire, how long it was after the ascension of Jesus, before Matthew and the other apostles left Judea, to go abroad into foreign countries.

And first of all, we will observe some remarkable passages of ancient writers, relating to this matter. And then, secondly, we will consider what light the book of the Acts may afford upon this subject.

Clement of Alexandria, about 194, quotes from a work,

[f] Ann. 60. num. 31.

entitled the Preaching of Peter, this passage: 'Therefore [a] Peter says, that the Lord said to the apostles; If any 'Israelite will repent, and believe in God through my name, 'his sins shall be forgiven. After twelve years go ye 'out into the world, that none may say, We have not 'heard.'

The next passage is that of Apollonius, undoubtedly in part cotemporary with Clement, and placed by Cave at the year 192, by me at 211, as near the time of his writing against the Montanists. 'Moreover, says[b] Eusebius, he re-'lates as from tradition, that our Saviour commanded his 'apostles not to depart from Jerusalem for the space of 'twelve years.' Which passage has been already cited in this [c] work.

By these two passages Cave was induced to think, that [d] for twelve years after Christ's ascension the apostles did not depart from the neighbourhood of Jerusalem. Supposing our Saviour to have been crucified, and to have ascended to heaven in the year 29 of the vulgar æra, which was a common opinion of the ancients, these twelve years ended in the year 41. Supposing those great events to have happened in the year 33, which is a common opinion of learned moderns, those twelve years would reach to the year 45.

Beside those two passages alleged by Cave, and other learned men, I shall take notice of some others also.

Origen says in general, 'That [e] when the Jews did not 'receive the word, the apostles went to the Gentiles.'

Chrysostom, in a homily upon Acts xi. 19, and what follows, speaks to this purpose. 'They heard that Samaria 'had received the word, and they sent Peter and John. 'They heard what had happened at Antioch, and they sent 'Barnabas; for [f] that was at a great distance. And it was 'not fit that the apostles should go so far as yet, lest they 'should have been esteemed deserters, and thought to have

[a] *Λαι τατο φησιν ὁ Πετρος ειρηκεναι τον Κυριον τοις αποστολοις· Εαν μεν αν τις θελησῃ τα Ισραηλ μετανοησαι* [forte *μετανοησας*] *δια τα ονοματος μα πιστευειν εις τον Θεον, αφεθησονται αυτῳ ἁμαρτιαι. Μετα δωδεκα ετη εξελθετε εις κοσμον, μη τις ειπῃ· Ουκ ηκουσαμεν.* Clem. Str. l. 6. p. 636. Conf. Cav. H. L. T. I.—5. et Grabe, Spic. T. I. p. 67.

[b] H. E. l. 5. cap. 18. p. 136. [c] Vol. ii. p. 393.

[d] Hist. Lit. T. i. p. 5. et 13.

[e] *——μη παραδεξαμενων Ιουδαιων τον λογον, απεληλυθεσαν εις τα εθνη.* In Matth. T. i. p. 225. E. Huet.

[f] *Πολυ γαρ το διαστημα, και ουκ εδει τους αποστολους τοτε χωρισθηναι εκειθεν. ινα μη νομισθωσιν ειναι φυγαδες, και τους αυτων πεφευγεναι· τοτε αναγκαιως χοριζονται, οτε λοιπον ανιατα εχειν εδοκει τα κατ' αυτους.* In Act. hom. 25. tom. ix. p. 202, 203.

'fled from their own people. But it then became necessary 'for them to separate, [or go from thence,] when the Jews 'showed themselves to be incurable.'

In the Paschal Chronicle are these expressions, speaking of Paul. 'Afterwards [g] he coming to Jerusalem with Bar-'nabas, and finding there Peter and the rest of the apostles, 'with James the Lord's brother, the apostles send an epistle 'to Antioch in Syria, establishing their church. And Paul 'and Barnabas carry the epistle to Antioch, as the Acts 'show. By this it appears, that the apostles then wrote their 'catholic epistles before their dispersion.'

Such are the passages of ancient writers, which must be reckoned to be of some weight.

Let us now observe the history in the Acts. And it seems to me, there is reason to conclude, that the apostles stayed in Judea, till after the council at Jerusalem, of which an account is given in the xvth chapter of that book. For St. Luke does continually speak of the apostles, as being at Jerusalem, or near it. Acts viii. 1; "And at that time, there was a great persecution against the church, which was at Jerusalem; and they were all scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria, except the apostles." One of those persons, who then left Jerusalem, was Philip the deacon and evangelist: who went to Samaria, and preached Christ unto them, and with good effect. Whereupon, at ver. 14, "Now when the apostles, which were at Jerusalem, heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John." This needs no comment. Here is proof, that when the rest of the disciples were scattered abroad, Peter and John, and the other apostles, were still at Jerusalem.

In Acts ix. 26—30, is St. Luke's account of Paul's coming to Jerusalem, after his conversion: where he says, "that the disciples were afraid of him—But Barnabas took him, and brought him to the apostles." St. Paul, speaking of the same journey, Gal. i. 18, 19, says: "Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem to see Peter, and abode with him fifteen days. But other of the apostles saw I none, save James the Lord's brother." Here we find, that at this time, three years after his conversion, Paul saw two

[g] *Μετεπειτα ελθων εις Ιεροσολυμα μετα Βαρναβα, και ευρων Πετρον και τους λοιπους αποστολους αμα Ιακωβῳ τῳ αδελφῳ του Κυριου, γραφουσιν επιστολην οἱ αποστολοι εις Αντιοχειαν της Συριας, θεμελιωντες την αυτων εκκλησιαν, και διακονουσι την επιστολην εις Αντιοχειαν αυτος Παυλος και Βαρναβας ως δηλωσιν αἱ Πραξεις. Εκ τουτου δεικνυται, ὁτι και τας καθολικας αυτων οἱ αποστολοι τοτε γραφουσιν, προ της διασπορας αυτων.* Chr. Pasch. p. 233. B. C.

apostles only, Peter and James. But St. Luke's words, as seems to me, imply, that all the apostles were then at Jerusalem, though Paul saw two only, the rest for some reasons declining to show themselves in person to him. Dr. Doddridge has this note upon ch. ix. 27. 'Paul himself 'tells us, that upon his going up to Jerusalem, he saw no 'other apostles but Peter and James. Gal. i. 19. Beza 'well observes we are quite uncertain on what occasion the 'rest were then absent from Jerusalem. Had they been 'there, though Paul stayed but about a fortnight, he would 'no doubt have seen them.' Nevertheless the solution of this difficulty appears to me very easy. The apostles were now all at Jerusalem, or near it: but they lived privately, because it was a time of persecution. The great persecution against the church, which began with the death of Stephen, was not yet over: the apostles therefore could not appear abroad without danger: and it was sufficient, that they spoke to Paul, and received him by Peter and James; which I take to be the true import of St. Luke's expression: "But Barnabas took him, and brought him to the apostles."

After Peter had been at the house of Cornelius, it is said, Acts xi. 1, "And the apostles and brethren that were in Judea, heard, that the Gentiles also had received the word." Another proof, that all the apostles, or most of them, were still at Jerusalem. But I do not suppose, that the apostles, like many other of the Jewish believers, were offended at what Peter had done. Or, if they were at first somewhat offended, they were soon, and easily satisfied, and were very willing to testify their approbation of Peter's conduct.

From the twelfth chapter of the Acts we know, that James, son of Zebedee, and brother of John, and Peter, were at Jerusalem, in the year 44, or thereabout, near the end of the reign of Herod Agrippa: the former of whom was beheaded, and the other imprisoned. And at ver. 17, is mention made of another James, supposed to be the Lord's brother, and always resident at Jerusalem.

From the account of the council of Jerusalem, and of the occasion of it, all the apostles appear to have been then in Judea, and at Jerusalem, or in its neighbourhood. Acts xv. 2; "When therefore Paul and Barnabas had no small dissension and disputation with them, they determined, that Paul, and Barnabas, and certain others of them, should go up to Jerusalem, unto the apostles and elders about this question." Ver. 4, "And when they were come to Jerusalem, they were received of the church, and 'or even' the

apostles, and elders.—Ver. 6, "And the apostles and elders came together, 'that is, met in council,' for to consider of this matter."—Ver. 22, "Then pleased it the apostles, and elders, with the whole church, to send chosen men of their own company to Antioch."—Ver. 23, "And they wrote letters by them after this manner: The apostles, and elders, and brethren, send greeting."—Ver. 33, "And after they had tarried there a space," that is, at "Antioch, they were let go in peace from the brethren unto the apostles."

In all these places the apostles must intend all the apostles, or the apostles in general: for how can the expression be understood otherwise?

If it should be said, that the apostles might be at the council at Jerusalem, though several of them had been before in other countries, I think, that would be said without ground and reason. It does not appear, that the apostles were sent to, invited, or called in from abroad, to attend this council: but the christians at Antioch supposed, or rather knew, that the apostles were at Jerusalem, and therefore directly sent thither to them.

Indeed none of the apostles are expressly named as speakers in the debates of the council, beside Peter and James: but all the rest may have been there. So upon divers other occasions in the gospels, and at the beginning of the Acts, Peter only spake, though all the rest were present. In Gal. ii. 8, 9, 10, St. Paul, giving an account of a journey to Jerusalem, supposed to be the same with this to the council, speaks of conferences which he had with three, namely, James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars. Here[h] is one more mentioned as present at Jerusalem, beside the two before taken notice of. And there must have been others beside these three, who seemed to be pillars, or were the most eminent.

The first time that we meet with the mention of any one of the twelve, as being out of Judea, is that in Gal. ii. 11, after this council, as is generally allowed, when Peter was at Antioch. It is very observable, Acts xi. 19—22, when "tidings came to the ears of the church at Jerusalem," that many Gentiles had been converted at Antioch by some of those who were scattered abroad by the persecution, "they sent forth Barnabas that he should go as far as Antioch." None of the apostles went, not so much as one, to accompany

[h] Theodoret has a like argument: Εξ ὧν ῥᾳδιον κατιδειν, ὡς ϐδεπω καταλελοιπει την Ιϐδαιαν ὁ θειος αποστολος Ιωαννης. Theodr. Pr. in ep. ad Eph. Tom. III. p. 290.

him. And afterwards, ch. xiii. 1—3, in the account of the extraordinary mission of Paul and Barnabas from Antioch to Cyprus, and other parts, there is no mention made of any apostle, as present at Antioch; and it is plain, there was not one there.

All these considerations induce me to think, that none of the twelve apostles left Judea to teach either Jews or Gentiles in other countries until after this council.

Having now, as I apprehend, shown this to be very probable, I shall mention some remarks; whereby there may be an opportunity for answering objections, though several have been already obviated.

1. There was a fitness in it. It was very proper, and even expedient, that the apostles should stay a good while in Judea, to assert and confirm the truth of Christ's resurrection by teaching, and by miraculous works, and do their utmost to bring the Jewish people to faith in Jesus as the Christ.

2. As this was fit, it is likely that they had received some command from Christ himself, or some direction from the Holy Ghost to stay thus long in Judea.

3. There were considerations that would incline them to it, and induce them to do what was fit to be done, and was agreeable to the mind of Christ. One was the difficulty of preaching the gospel in foreign countries. This would induce them to stay in Judea till the circumstances of things facilitated their farther progress, or called them to it. Another thing was their affection for the Jewish people, their countrymen, especially those of Judea, with whom they had been brought up, and among whom they dwelt, together with a persuasion of the great value of the blessing of the gospel. This last consideration, I apprehend, would induce them to labour in Judea, with earnest desires, and some hopes of bringing all, or however many, to faith in Jesus. This influenced Paul also to a great degree, and for a good while. Nor was he without hopes of persuading his brethren and countrymen to what appeared to himself very certain and evident: so he says in his speech to the people at Jerusalem. Acts xxii. 17—20. He assures them, that whilst he was worshipping at Jerusalem, in the temple, he had a trance or ecstasy: that he there saw Christ, who said to him, "Make haste, and get thee quickly out of Jerusalem; for they will not receive thy testimony concerning me." Paul pleaded, that they must needs pay a regard to his testimony, who was well known to have been for some while very zealous in opposing his followers,

and was now convinced and persuaded. But the Lord said unto him, "Depart; for I will send thee far hence unto the Gentiles." This trance, or vision, seems to have happened in the year 44, after that Paul had preached at Antioch with great success among Gentiles. Nevertheless he had an earnest desire to make one attempt more among the Jews of Judea, where was the body of that people: and if they could have been persuaded, many abroad would follow their example. And it required an express and repeated order from Jesus Christ, in vision, to induce him to lay aside that design, and to proceed to preach to Gentiles in remote parts.

It is a most affectionate concern, which he expresses for the Jewish people in divers places of the epistle to the Romans, written so late as the year 58. ch. ix. 1—5; x. 1, 2; xi. 4; "if by any means," says he, "I may provoke them to emulation which are my flesh, and might save some of them." Nor can it be questioned, that the like sentiments prevailed in the other apostles. If it needs any proof, let St. Peter's discourses at the beginning of the book of the Acts be consulted, particularly ch. ii. 38—40; iii. 22—26; not to refer to any other.

4. There were many advantages attending the stay of the apostles in Judea. Many more Jews were by this means converted, than otherwise there would have been. St. Luke says, Acts iv. 4, that "the number of the men was five thousand." But when Paul came to Jerusalem some years afterwards, James says to him, "Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of Jews there are which believe," ch. xxi. 20. And it is very likely, that the Jewish believers had better and freer principles, than otherwise they would have had. They were, it is true, for observing the law themselves, ver. 20: but they agreed, that the Gentiles were under no such obligations, ver. 25. Farther, by this means every step taken in planting the christian religion, and spreading the gospel in the world, had the sanction of all the apostles, and of the whole church of Jerusalem.

Upon occasion of the persecution at Jerusalem, many were "scattered abroad, who went every where preaching the word. Then Philip went down to the city of Samaria, and preached Christ unto them," Acts viii. 5. "Now when the apostles, which were at Jerusalem, heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John." This was the first step taken in carrying the gospel to any, beside native Jews, and proselytes to their religion. And what had been done by

Philip at Samaria, was approved and ratified by all the apostles.

The next step was preaching to Gentiles, which work was solemnly allotted to Peter. "And the apostles and elders that were in Judea, heard that the Gentiles also had received the word of God," ch. xi. 1. Upon Peter's rehearsing to them the whole affair, and what had happened at the house of Cornelius at Cæsarea, all were satisfied. "They glorified God, saying: then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life," ver. 18.

Soon after this, some of those who were scattered abroad upon the persecution, went to Antioch, and there "spake to the Greeks," or Gentiles, "preaching the Lord Jesus. And a great number believed, and turned to the Lord. Then tidings of these things came unto the ears of the church, which was at Jerusalem; and they sent forth Barnabas, that he should go as far as Antioch," ver. 19—22. This step therefore was also approved and ratified by the whole church of Jerusalem, including the apostles.

And henceforward no objections could be made by wise men against preaching to Gentiles and receiving them, but what arose from the difficulty of the work. Nevertheless some good while after this, there was a dispute raised at Antioch by some bigoted Jews, who asserted it to be necessary, that the Gentile believers "should be circumcised after the manner of Moses." This occasioned the council of Jerusalem; where the controversy was fully determined by the apostles and elders: which was a great advantage. By this means the manner of receiving Gentiles was fixed, and settled beyond dispute, and beyond opposition: or, if any should be made afterwards, it could not be successful, nor very troublesome. And we may be assured, that all the apostles, and their disciples, would be harmonious, and preach the same doctrine to Jews and Gentiles, wheresoever they went.

5. There was a necessity of the apostles staying in Judea, till about this time. Otherwise, they could not have sufficiently testified the doctrine concerning Jesus in Judea, nor have fully taught the Jewish people, so as to render them inexcusable, if they did not believe, and repent.

If we consider the state of things in Judea, we may discern, that in the year 44, the apostles had not had an opportunity to fulfil their ministry in that country. It must be evident to all from the history in the Acts, that for some while, soon after our Lord's ascension, the apostles were

grievously harassed, and hardly used by the Jewish council or rulers: which was the more so, because of the weakness of Pilate's government, for some time before he was dismissed from the province. And afterwards, about the time of his removal, Stephen was stoned, and a great persecution began: which, as I apprehend, continued from the beginning of the year 36, to the beginning of the year 40, when the churches had rest: of which rest, undoubtedly, the apostles made good use. St. Luke's words are: "Then had the churches rest throughout Judea, and Galilee, and Samaria, and were edified, and walking in the fear of the Lord, and in the comfort of the Holy Ghost, were multiplied," ch. ix. 31. After which follows an account of Peter's passing throughout all quarters, his going to Lydda, and there healing Æneas, then to Joppa, where he raised Tabitha: and from thence to Cæsarea, and there preaching to Cornelius, and his company: and of some other matters, reaching to ch. xi. 26. How long that rest, or peace and tranquillity continued, in all its fulness, we cannot say exactly: perhaps it lasted a year, or more. And it is not unlikely, that in that space of time other apostles, beside Peter, travelled in Judea, and the several parts of it, preaching the gospel, and confirming the disciples. But upon Herod Agrippa being made king of all Judea by Claudius in the year 41, that peace would be abated, if not interrupted. From the beginning of his reign, especially from his arrival in Judea, and during the remainder of it, the disciples must have been under many difficulties, and discouragements, prince and people being of one mind. And toward the end of his reign he became an open and violent persecutor, till Divine Providence smote him that he died. After his death Judea came to be in the hands of Roman procurators, Cuspius Fadus, Tiberius Alexander, Cumanus, Felix, Festus: when, probably, the disciples of Jesus had for several years together more liberty than they had had at any time since the resurrection of Jesus, excepting the interval of rest and tranquillity, before taken notice of. For those governors or procurators had no orders from the Roman emperor to persecute or disturb any Jews. And that those governors were not disposed to disturb the christians, may be argued from the treatment given to Paul by Felix, and Festus, and the officers under them. Now therefore from the year 44, to the time of the council in 49, or 50, and afterwards, the apostles went on fulfilling their ministry. All of them, as I apprehend, stayed in Judea, till the time of the council: soon after which some did,

probably, go abroad. However, several of them might stay there a good while longer, and not remove, till a little before the commencement of the Jewish war in 66.

6. We may now perceive the benefit of the early choice and call of Paul to be an apostle. Who having been several years employed and exercised in preaching to Jews in Judea, and out of it, was ready to preach to Gentiles likewise, as soon as a door was opened for applying to them at Antioch, and other places: as there was, after Peter had received Cornelius at Cæsarea: whilst it was not as yet fit for any of the twelve apostles to leave the land of Israel.

7. We now obtain some assistance for interpreting those expressions of Paul, Gal. ii. 7, 8, 9. "When they saw that the gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto me, as the gospel of the circumcision was committed unto Peter. For he that wrought effectually in Peter to the apostleship of the circumcision, the same was mighty in me toward the Gentiles. And they gave unto me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship, that we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision." And Rom. xi. 13, "inasmuch as I am the apostle of the Gentiles, I magnify mine office." Those expressions cannot be intended to signify that Paul was apostle of the Gentiles only, and exclusive of the Jews: or that Peter, and the other of the twelve, were apostles of the circumcision only, exclusive of the Gentiles. For an apostle is a teacher or master of the whole world. They were appointed to be so by Christ: nor could their commission be limited by any compact among themselves. Our Lord's commission given to his twelve apostles, is in Matthew to this purpose: "Go ye therefore and teach all nations," ch. xxviii. 19, and in Luke xxiv. 46, 47, "He said to them, that repentance and forgiveness of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." And Acts i. 8, "And ye shall be witnesses unto me in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth." And Mark xvi. 15, "And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." And ver. 20. "And they went forth and preached every where." Of Paul, the Lord says in a vision to Ananias at Damascus: "He is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel," Acts ix. 5. And Paul says to king Agrippa: "I was not disobedient to the heavenly vision: but showed first unto them of Damascus, and at Jerusalem, and

throughout all the coast of Judea, and then to the Gentiles, that they should repent, and turn to God," ch. xxvi. 19, 20. Moreover we know from the history of Paul's preaching recorded in the Acts, that he always first addressed himself to Jews, in all the places where he came, if there were any, and if they had there a synagogue.

It should be observed likewise, that Peter had actually preached to Gentiles in Judea, and was the first disciple of Jesus that did so. There is a particular account of it in the book of the Acts, ch. x. and xi. And himself takes notice of it in his speech at the council of Jerusalem, ch. xv 7.

The reason therefore why the gospel of the circumcision is said to have been committed unto Peter, and the other apostles with him, is, that for a good while their ministry was solely, or however very much, and chiefly employed among Jews in Judea: though afterwards they preached very freely to Gentiles in several parts of the world. And Paul is called the apostle of the Gentiles, and the gospel of the uncircumcision is said to have been committed unto him, because he got the start of all the rest in preaching to Gentiles, and had laboured among them for a good while in divers countries with great success, and had formed many churches in divers places: whilst they were still in Judea teaching Jews, and had made no addresses to Gentiles abroad in other countries.

It may be also implied in what St. Paul says in the epistle to the Galatians, that [i] several of the first twelve apostles intended to stay still somewhat longer in Judea. This they were the more willing to do, being fully satisfied with the preaching of Paul in foreign countries: insomuch that they encouraged him to proceed as he had begun.

8. Once more, we may now be reconciled to the supposition of the late date of the gospels. For they were not to be published till the doctrine concerning Jesus had been preached in divers parts, and many converts had been made, to whom they would be useful, for whom they would be needful, by whom they would be received with joy, be highly valued, frequently read, and often copied. Written

[i] Alterum, quod ex dicto Pauli ad Galatas colligimus, illud est, Joannem etiam post discessum Pauli cum duobus collegis per aliquod temporis intervallum Hierosolymis, et in Judæâ substitisse. Gentium enim conversione Paulo et Barnabæ demandatâ, ipsi inter Judæos se operam porrolocaturos declarant. Quæ etiam causa est, cur Joannis et sociorum in Actis Apostolicis vix mentio occurrat, quia, postquam primordia ecclesiæ christianæ inter Judæos memorata erant, nihil amplius videbatur addendum, nisi ut narretur, quomodo primitiæ Gentium essent introductæ. Lamp. Proleg. in Jo. l. 1. cap. 3. sect. vii.

histories of Jesus could be little wanted by the Jewish believers in Judea, whilst all the apostles were still in that country, and there were also still living among them many sincere followers of Jesus, and eye-witnesses of his person and ministry. Very probably, therefore, there was no written gospel till after the council at Jerusalem.

Still there may be objections which should be stated and considered.

Obj. 1. It may be said: Was not the progress of the gospel by this means much retarded? I answer: No. And this objection, methinks, should be of little moment now, after all that has been said of the many advantages of the apostles' stay in Judea.

However, some considerations shall be here added to what has been already said. Though the apostles did not leave Judea themselves, they encouraged those who did, who preached the gospel abroad, whether to Jews or Gentiles. Of this there is an instance with regard to the church of Antioch, related, Acts xi. 19—22. And there may have been some other like instances. Moreover the apostles were very useful by their stay in Judea, as has been already shown. They made many converts among the Jews. During their stay in that country, if there was any measure of public liberty for the believers, the apostles would all, or most of them, be at Jerusalem, at the great feasts, to which there was a general resort of Jews from all countries. Here the inquisitive of that people would have an opportunity of conversing with the apostles: and if they were convinced, and persuaded by them, they would carry the doctrine of the gospel into the places of their usual residence, and propagate it there.

Obj. 2. But, if the apostles had attempted to make a long stay in Judea, it seems that they must have been all destroyed. I answer, that doubtless they met with many and great difficulties. What they were from the time of our Lord's ascension to the year 44, was briefly rehearsed just now. After that, for several years, as I apprehend, their difficulties would not be so great as they had been. Yea, during that space would be the best opportunity that ever they had to promote the interests of the gospel, as I said before. For[k] the Jewish people had not the power of

[k] Contra persuasum habeo, hoc emblema supponere, ecclesiam jam longo admodum tempore fuisse afflictam—ne jam dicam, non constare ex historiâ ecclesiæ, quinam illi sint Martyres, quorum sanguis, præter eum Stephani, et utriusque Jacobi de quorum altero ex Lucâ, altero ex Josepho liquet et Hegesippo, a Judæis fusus fuerit. Judæi enim, excepto brevi intervallo regni

life and death in their own hands. And the Roman procurators were not disposed to give any men disturbance upon account of difference of opinion in religious matters. Finally, the apostles of Jesus Christ, we have reason to think, had an especial direction, and an especial protection. They, who were employed in teaching so important a doctrine, and were enabled to work miracles upon others for confirming it, may be reasonably supposed to have been the subjects of some wonderful interpositions of Providence. And it must be reckoned very probable, that affairs would be so overruled and influenced, as that these chosen men should be upheld and enabled to fulfil their ministry, and bear such a testimony to Jesus, as should be sufficient to lay a good foundation for the establishment of his church in the world, and leave all those of the Jewish people, who did not receive him as the Messiah, absolutely inexcusable.

CHAP. VII.

ST. MARK, EVANGELIST.

I. *That the evangelist is the same as John Mark, and nephew to Barnabas.* II. *His history from the New Testament.* III. *From other writers.* IV. *Testimonies to his gospel, in ancient writers.* V. *Remarks upon them.* VI. *The time of writing his gospel, according to these ancient writers, and the sentiments of learned moderns.* VII. *Characters of time in the gospel itself.* VIII. *Observations upon this gospel.*

I. IT is generally, or even universally, allowed, that Mark, mentioned, 1 Pet. v. 13[3], is the evangelist. But it has been doubted, whether he be the same as John Mark mentioned in the Acts, and some of St. Paul's epistles; and it appears from our collections out of ancient authors, that there were doubts about this in the minds of some in former times.

Agrippæ, rerum suarum non erant domini: et, licet in christianos pessime affecti fuerint, a præsidibus tamen Romanis prohibebantur pro lubitu in innocuos Jesu Christi discipulos sævire. Quæ enim junior Ananus tentavit in Jacobum fratrem Domini, et τινας ἑτερους, 'quosdam alios,' christianæ professionis homines, ut constat ex Josepho, Festo mortuo, et Albino adhuc in itinere agente, peracta sunt. Campeg. Vitring. in Apoc. cap. vi. ver. 12. sect. xxx. n. 303.

Divers learned moderns are persuaded, that they are different persons. Of this number are [a] Cave, [who nevertheless think him [b] the same Mark, that is mentioned by St. Paul in his second epistle to Timothy,] [c] Grotius, [d] Du Pin, and [e] Tillemont. Which last, in his Ecclesiastical Memoirs, makes two different articles for this name: one entitled St. Mark the evangelist, apostle of Egypt, and martyr: the other, St. John Mark, disciple and cousin of St. Barnabas. On the other hand they are reckoned one and the same by [f] Jer. Jones, [g] Lightfoot, and [h] Wetstein.

I shall now without delay consider the reasons of those, who think there are two Marks mentioned in the New Testament.

1. They say, that Mark the evangelist was converted and baptized by Peter, because he calls him his son, 1. Pet. v. 13. But there is no reason to suppose this of John Mark.

To which I answer. That needs not to be reckoned the constant meaning of the expression. It may denote only great affection and tenderness, and a respect to faithful services: in like manner as Paul says of Timothy, Philip. ii. 22, that "as a son with the father he had served with him in the gospel." Grotius [i] and Du Pin, [k] who mention this reason, seem not to have judged it conclusive. Moreover, if Mark was a convert of Peter, it does not follow, that he was not an early believer; for he might be one of that

[a] Marcus evangelista, quem cum Joanne Marco, de quo Act. xii. 12, male nonnulli confundunt. H. L. T. i. p. 24.

[b] Cum enim illum epistolâ secundâ ad Timotheum—Romam accersiverat Paulus.—Id. ib. [c] Gr. Pr. in Marc.

[d] Diss. Prelim. l. 2. ch. ii. sect. iv. [e] Mem. Ec. Tom. ii.

[f] New and full Method, vol. iii. ch. vi. p. 65—70.

[g] Lightfoot is making observations upon the first epistle of St. Peter. 'He sends this epistle, says he, by Silvanus, Paul's old attendant, but now with Peter—His naming of Mark with him calls our thoughts back to what has been mentioned of Mark heretofore: his being with Paul at Rome, and his coming from him into the east. To suppose two Marks, one with Peter, and another with Paul, is to breed confusion where there needeth not.—It is easily seen how John Mark came into familiarity with Paul and Peter. And other Mark we can find none in the New Testament, unless of our own invention.—He it was that wrote the gospel.' Lightfoot, Harm. of the N. T. vol. i. p. 336.

[h] Nihil vetat, quo minus simpliciter cum Victore et Theophylacto hunc eundem Marcum intelligamus, quoties illius nomen in Actis et epistolis reperimus. Wetst. Pr. in Marc. tom. i. p. 551.

[i] Adde quod Joannes Marcus inter primos christianos: Marcus hic, ut videtur, Petri operâ conversus. 1 Pet. v. 13. Nam tales peculiariter 'filios suos' apostoli vocabant. 1 Cor. iv. 15. Gal. iv. 19. Gr. Pr. in Marc.

[k] Il y a plus d'apparence, qu'il a reçû l'evangile de S. Pierre, qui l'appelle fils, peutêtre parcequ'il l'avoit engendre en J. C. Diss. Prel. l. 2. ch. 2. sect. iv.

apostle's converts at his first preaching the gospel at Jerusalem. Mark the evangelist, upon that supposition, could not be one of the seventy: but he might be among the first believers, and the son of Mary. However, I choose not to insist upon this, but chiefly upon what was before mentioned: that the appellation, my son, needs not to be understood rigorously as meaning a convert begotten to the faith of the gospel.

2. It is said, that [l] Mark, the companion of Paul, was called John: but the evangelist is never so called by the ancients, who mention him.

To which I answer. It is true, that Paul's companion is sometimes called John, as Acts xiii. 5, and 13. But we are also informed that he was surnamed Mark. So Acts xii. 12, "And when he had considered the thing, he came to the house of Mary, the mother of John, whose surname was Mark." And ver. 25,—"and took with them John, whose surname was Mark." And he is several times mentioned by the surname, Mark, only. Acts xv. 39; 2 Tim. iv. 11; Col. iv. 10; Philem. ver. 24. Secondly, such of the ancients, as supposed Mark, the evangelist, to have been the same with him mentioned in the Acts, must also have supposed that he was called John as well as Mark, though they have generally mentioned him by his surname.

3. It is said [m] that John Mark was much with Paul, Mark the evangelist, with Peter; so say the ancients in general.

I answer: it is not at all impossible but that Mark might be sometimes with Paul, at other times with Peter; as may appear by and by.

As these reasons therefore do not appear to me conclusive, I rather think that there is but one Mark in the New Testament, John Mark, the evangelist, and fellow-labourer of Paul, and Barnabas, and Peter.

II. I now proceed to write the history of John Mark from the New Testament, mentioning, as they offer, some

[l] Joannes quoque ille Mariæ filius, Barnabæ consanguineus,—Marcus vocabatur: quem multi hunc nostrum scriptorem putant. Quibus quo minus assentiar, moveor veterum auctoritate, qui hunc scriptorem Joannem nunquam, Marcum semper vocant.—Grot. Pr. in Marc.

L' evangeliste n'est appellé nulle part du nom de Jean, qui etoit le nom propre de celui-ci. Du Pin, ubi supra.

[m] Et ita Petro addunt [veteres] comitem, ac discipulum, ut non tantum de Barnabâ, sed et de Paulo, quem Joannes Marcus post illud frigusculum sectatus est—nihil meminerint. Grot. ibid.

Il étoit disciple de S. Pierre, et attaché à lui, dans le tems que l' autre étoit avec S. Paul, et S. Barnabe Du Pin, Ibid.

observations, showing his acquaintance with Peter as well as with Paul: after which I shall take notice of some other things said of him by the ancients.

He was the son of Mary, a pious woman at Jerusalem, and an early believer, at whose house the disciples used to meet, and that in troublesome and difficult times, as well as at other seasons. Peter, having been delivered out of prison by an angel, "came to the house of Mary, mother of John, whose surname was Mark, where many were gathered together praying," Acts xii. 12. So that the very first mention of John Mark assures us of Peter's intimacy in that family.

That deliverance of St. Peter happened in the year 44, about the same time that Paul and Barnabas came to Jerusalem from Antioch with contributions for the relief of the brethren in Judea, in the time of a famine or scarcity. And it is said at the end of that chapter: "And Barnabas and Saul returned from Jerusalem, when they had fulfilled their ministry, and took with them John, whose surname was Mark." This, with some other things to be hereafter mentioned, may dispose us to think that this John Mark is the same who, in Col. iv. 10, is called "sister's son to Barnabas."

Mark therefore went now from Jerusalem to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas: and when, some short time afterwards, they went abroad to other countries, Mark accompanied them as their minister. Acts xiii. 5. They went to Cyprus, and preached the word in that country. But when they returned to the continent, and came on shore "at Perga in Pamphylia, he departed from them, and returned to Jerusalem," ver. 13. He therefore did not attend them in their farther progress to Antioch in Pisidia, Iconium, and other places, but went to Jerusalem.

And now, very probably, he conversed again with Peter and the other apostles, and was present with them at their discourses and their devotions. For, as I apprehend, all the apostles were still in Judea, except James the son of Zebedee, who had been beheaded by Herod Agrippa, in the beginning of the year 44.

Paul and Barnabas, having finished their progress, returned to Antioch, and there abode. Whilst they were there, debates arose about circumcising Gentile converts; which determined Paul and Barnabas to go to Jerusalem. That controversy being decided, they returned to Antioch.

Some time afterwards "Paul said unto Barnabas: Let us

go again and visit our brethren in every city where we have preached the word, and see how they do. And Barnabas determined to take with them John, whose surname was Mark. But Paul thought it not good to take him with them, who had departed from them from Pamphylia, and went not with them to the work." Barnabas, however, persisted in his resolution, and went with Mark to Cyprus: and Paul chose Silas to accompany him. Acts xv. 36—41.

Hereby we perceive the good temper of Mark. He was now at Antioch, and was willing to attend Paul and Barnabas in their journies, and actually went with Barnabas to Cyprus. And though Paul would not now accept of his attendance, he was afterwards fully reconciled to him. Mark is mentioned in several of his epistles sent from Rome, during his confinement there. I suppose, I shall hereafter show, that St. Paul's second epistle to Timothy was written in the summer of the year 61, not long after Paul's arrival at Rome. In that epistle he writes to Timothy, to come to him; and he desires him to bring Mark with him. 2 Tim. iv. 11, "Take Mark, and bring him with thee: for he is profitable to me for the ministry." Where Mark then was, does not clearly appear. It is probable, that he was either at Ephesus, or at some other place, where Timothy would find him in his journey from Ephesus to Rome: and unquestionably Mark did come with Timothy. He is mentioned in two of the epistles written by the apostle at Rome. Philem. ver. 24. and Col. iv. 10. "Aristarchus salutes you, and Mark, sister's son to Barnabas, touching whom ye received commandments; if he come unto you, receive him." Mark is not mentioned in the epistle to the Philippians. Perhaps he was not acquainted there, or upon some occasion was absent from the apostle, when that epistle was written: or rather he is comprehended in those general expressions, ch. iv. 21, "The brethren that are with me, greet you." For in the epistle to the Philippians St. Paul does not mention his fellow-labourers by name as he does in the epistles to the Colossians, and to Philemon. Nor is he mentioned in the epistle to the Ephesians. To those who admit the true date of that epistle the reason will be obvious: it was written and sent away, before Mark came to be with St. Paul at Rome.

This is all we can say concerning St. Mark from the New Testament. But from that we can collect his excellent character, and may conclude, that after this time he no

longer attended on Paul. It is not improbable, that going now into Asia, he there met with St. Peter, and accompanied him, till that apostle came to Rome, where he suffered martyrdom: where likewise Mark wrote and published the gospel that goes by his name.

III. We will now inquire, whether there is any thing in other writers to illustrate the history of this evangelist.

Cave says, without hesitation, that[n] Mark was a Levite; but he does not say upon what authority. I do not remember that it is in any of the writers of which I have given a particular account, excepting[o] Bede. It is also in a commentary upon St. Mark's gospel, usually joined with Jerom's works, though[p] allowed not to be his. That writer says, that[q] Mark was a Levite and a priest. It is not unlikely that this was inferred from Mark's relation to Barnabas, who was a Levite of Cyprus. Comp. Acts iv. 36, and Col. iv. 10. But then Cave should not have denied, as he does in the same place, that Mark the evangelist is the same as John Mark mentioned in the Acts: for that, as I apprehend, is to remove out of the way the sole ground of this opinion.

By Eusebius we are informed, it[r] was said, that Mark going into Egypt, first preached there the gospel, which he had written, and planted there many churches. And afterwards in another chapter, he says, that[s] in the eighth year of Nero, Anianus, the first bishop of Alexandria after Mark, the apostle and evangelist, took upon him the care of that church. Of which Anianus he gives a great character, as beloved of God, and a wonderful man.

Epiphanius says, that soon after Matthew, Mark, companion of Peter, composed his gospel at Rome. And

[n] S. Marcus evangelista, quem cum Joanne Marco, de quo Act. xii. 12. male nonnulli confundunt, erat Levites. H. L. T. I. p. 24.

[o] Tradunt autem hunc, natione Israëliticâ, et sacerdotali ortum prosapiâ, ac post passionem ac resurrectionem Domini Salvatoris, ad prædicationem apostolorum evangelicâ fide a sacramentis imbutum, atque ex eorum fuisse numero, de quibus scribit Lucas, quia multa etiam turba sacerdotum obediebat fidei. Bed. Prol. in Marc.

[p] Vid. Benedictin. Monitum, et Petav. Animadv. ad Epiph. H. 21. num. vi. p. 88.

[q] Marcus evangelista Dei, Petri discipulus, Leviticus genere, et sacerdos, in Italiâ hoc scripsit evangelium. Præf. in Marc. ap. Hieron. T. V. p. 886.

[r] *Τουτον δε Μαρκον πρωτον φασιν επι της Αιγυπτου σταλαμενον, το ευαγγελιον ὁ δη και συνεγραψατο κηρυξαι, εκκλησιας τε πρωτον επ' αυτης Αλεξανδρειας συστησασθαι. κ. λ.* H. E. l. 2. cap. 16.

[s] *—πρωτος μετα Μαρκον τον αποστολον και ευαγγελιστην, της εν Αλεξανδρειᾳ παροικιας, Ανιανος την λειτουργιαν διαδεχεται· ανηρ θεοφιλης ων, και τα παντα θαυμασιος.* Ibid. cap. 24.

having [t] written it, he was sent by Peter into the country of the Egyptians.

Jerom, in his article of St. Mark, as [u] before quoted, after other things, says: 'Taking [v] the gospel, which himself 'had composed, he went to Egypt, and at Alexandria 'founded a church of great note—He died in the eighth 'year of Nero, and was buried at Alexandria, where he was 'succeeded, as bishop, by Anianus.'

From all these accounts, I think, it must appear to be probable, that if indeed Mark preached at all in Egypt, and founded a church at Alexandria; it must have been after he had written his gospel, and after the death of Peter and Paul at Rome. Nevertheless, when presently afterwards Eusebius and Jerom likewise speak of Mark's converts, and Philo's Therapeuts, as all one, they seem to have imagined, that Mark had very early preached in Egypt. But what they say upon that head is exceedingly strange and unaccountable. For they both suppose, that Mark had written his gospel at Rome, before he went into Egypt: and that his gospel was not written before the reign of Nero. If therefore Mark went at all to Alexandria, it was later in the same reign: and Philo's Therapeuts could not be christians, nor Mark's converts: but were a sort of people, who had a being, and had formed their institution, before the gospel could be published in Egypt, and before the rise of the christian religion.

By Baronius [w] and many others, it is said, that St. Mark died a martyr. This is admitted by [x] Cave, and the [y] late Mr. Wetstein: but it is disputed by [z] S. Basnage; and as seems to me, with good reason. For St. Mark is not spoken of as a martyr by Eusebius, or other more ancient writers: and Jerom, as before quoted, says, St. Mark died in the eighth year of Nero, and was buried at Alexandria. He does not say, that he was crowned with martyrdom: as he would have done, if he had known of it: and his

[t] ——και γραψας αποστελλεται ὑπο τε ἁγιε Πετρε εις την των Αιγυπτιων χωραν. II. 51. num. 6.

[u] Vol. iv. ch. cxiv. num. viii. 2.

[v] Assumpto itaque evangelio, quod ipse confecerat, porrexit ad Ægyptum, et primus Alexandriæ Christum annuntians constituit ecclesiam—Denique Philo—videns Alexandriæ primam ecclesiam adhuc judaïzantem, quasi in laudem gentis suæ, librum super eorum conversatione conscripsit. De V. L. cap. 8.

[w] An. 64. sect. i. ii.

[x] Alexandriæ primus episcopus factus martyrium ibi subiit; quo vero anno mihi hactenus incompertum. H. L. p. 24.

[y] Tandem vero in Ægyptum concessisse, atque Alexandriæ sanguine suo doctrinam Christi confirmâsse, historia ecclesiastica testatur. J. J. Wetsten. N. T. tom. I. p. 551.

[z] Ann. 66. num. xix. xx.

expressions seem to imply a natural death. Fabricius,[a] in his account of St. Mark, says nothing of his having been a martyr.

IV. Having thus written the history of St. Mark, I shall now recollect the testimonies to his gospel, which we have seen in ancient writers, particularly with a view of ascertaining the time of it: observing likewise whatever may farther lead us into the knowledge of his station and character, and whether he was one of Christ's seventy disciples or not.

The first writer to be here taken notice of is Papias, about A. D. 116. He says, 'That[b] the elder, from whom 'he had divers informations, said, Mark, being the inter-'preter of Peter, wrote what he remembered: but not in the 'order in which things were spoken and done by Christ. 'For he was not a hearer of the Lord, but afterwards fol-'lowed Peter.'

Irenæus, as before[c] cited, about 178, says: 'After the 'death of Peter and Paul, Mark, the disciple and interpre-'ter of Peter, delivered to us in writing the things that had 'been preached by Peter.' In another place[d] he calls Mark 'the interpreter and follower of Peter.'

Clement of Alexandria, about the year of Christ 194, says: 'That[e] Peter's hearers at Rome, not content with 'a single hearing, nor with an unwritten instruction in the 'divine doctrine, entreated Mark, the follower of Peter, that 'he would leave with them in writing a memorial of the 'doctrine, which had been delivered to them by word of 'mouth: nor did they desist, until they had prevailed with 'him. Thus they were the means of writing the gospel, 'which is called according to Mark. It is said, that when 'the apostle knew what had been done, he was pleased 'with the zeal of the men, and authorized that scripture to 'be read in the churches.' That passage is cited from Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History.

Again, Eusebius says: 'Clement[f] informs us, that the 'occasion of writing the gospel according to Mark was 'this. Peter, having publicly preached the word at 'Rome, and having spoken the gospel by the Spirit, many 'who were there entreated Mark to write the things that 'had been spoken, he having long accompanied Peter, and 'retaining what he had said: and that when he had com-'posed the gospel, he delivered it to them, who had

[a] Vid. Fabr. Bib. Gr. l. 4. cap. v. n. iii. tom. III. p. 130—132.
[b] Vol. ii. p. 119. [c] P. 170. [d] P. 171.
[e] P. 224, 225. [f] P. 226.

'asked it of him: which when Peter knew, he neither for-'bade it, nor encouraged it.'

Many remarks were[g] formerly made upon these accounts of Clement, which cannot now be repeated. But it may be needful to say something here for reconciling Irenæus and him. Irenæus said, that Mark published his gospel after the death of Peter and Paul: whereas Clement supposes Peter to have been still living, and that this gospel was shown to Peter, who did not disapprove of it; but the difference is not great. Clement says, that Mark's gospel was written at Rome at the request of the christians there, who were hearers of Peter. If so, it could not be composed long before Peter's death. For I take it to be certain, that Peter did not come to Rome, until the reign of Nero was far advanced, nor very long before his own death. So that it may be reckoned not improbable, that Mark's gospel was not published, or did not become generally known, till after the death of Peter and Paul, as Irenæus says.

Tertullian, about the year 200, speaks of Mark as[h] an apostolical man, or companion of apostles: and says, 'That[i] 'the gospel published by Mark, may be reckoned Peter's, 'whose interpreter he was.'

Says Origen, about 230, 'The[k] second gospel is that 'according to Mark, who wrote it as Peter dictated it to 'him: who therefore calls him his son in his catholic epis-'tle.' See 1 Peter v. 13.

Eusebius, about 315, may be supposed to agree in the main with Clement and Irenæus, whose passages he has transcribed and inserted in his Ecclesiastical History. And in a long passage of his Evangelical Demonstration, formerly transcribed[l] by us, he says: 'Peter out of abundance of 'modesty thought not himself worthy to write a gospel. 'But Mark, who was his friend and disciple, is said to have 'recorded Peter's relations of the acts of Jesus.' At the end of which passage he says: 'And[m] Peter testifies these 'things of himself: for all things in Mark are said to be 'memoirs of Peter's discourses.' He likewise says, 'that '[n]Mark was not present to hear what Jesus said.' Nor[o] does it appear, that he thought the writer of the gospel to be John, surnamed Mark, nephew to Barnabas. But unquestionably he supposed him to be the same that is mentioned, 1 Pet. v. 13.

Mark is mentioned among the other evangelists by

[g] Vol. ii. p. 121, 122, 226—234.
[h] P. 274—277.
[i] P. 276.
[k] P. 494.
[l] Vol. iv. p. 92, 93.
[m] P. 93.
[n] P. 92.
[o] P. 117.

[p] Athanasius, without other particularities. But in the Synopsis, ascribed to him, and by many supposed to be written by another Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria, near the end of the fifth century, it is said, 'That[q] the gospel according to Mark was dictated by Peter at Rome, and published by Mark, and preached by him in Alexandria, and Egypt, and Pentapolis, and Lybia.'

The author of the Dialogue against the Marcionites, about 330, says, that[r] Mark was one of Christ's seventy disciples.

Epiphanius, about 368, says: 'Matthew[s] wrote first, and 'Mark soon after him, being a companion of Peter at 'Rome.' Afterwards he says, 'That[t] Mark was one of 'Christ's seventy disciples, and likewise one of those who 'were offended at the words of Christ, recorded John vi. '44, and then forsook him: but he was afterwards re-'covered by Peter, and being filled with the Spirit wrote a 'gospel.'

Upon the last passage of Epiphanius, Petavius says: 'Mark[u] might, possibly, have seen Christ, and have been 'one of the seventy: but it is said by very few ancient 'writers of the church.'

In the Constitutions, Mark[v] is reckoned with Luke a fellow-labourer with Paul: which may induce us to think, that the author supposed Mark the evangelist to be John Mark, mentioned in the Acts, and some of St. Paul's epistles.

Gregory Nazianzen says, 'that[w] Mark wrote his gospel 'for the Italians,' or in Italy.

Ebedjesu says, 'The[x] second evangelist is Mark, who 'preached [or wrote] in Latin, in the famous city of 'Rome.'

Jerom's article of this evangelist, in his Book of Illustrious Men, is to this purpose: 'Mark,[y] disciple and interpreter of Peter, at the desire of the brethren at Rome, 'wrote a short gospel according to what he had heard re-'lated by Peter: which when Peter knew, he approved of 'it, and authorized it to be read in the churches: as Clement

[p] Vol. iv. p. 155. [q] P. 165. [r] P. 167.
[s] P. 188. [t] Ibid.
[u] Dissentit Papias apud Eusebium—Quod autem asserunt nonnulli, Marcum non vidisse Dominum, viderit necne, non affirmo. Videre quidem potuisse, temporum ipsa ratio persuadet. Neque vero damnanda est Epiphanii sententia, dum illum e LXXII. discipulorum numero fuisse tradat, etsi contrarium alii patres tradant. Petav. ad loc. Animadv. p. 88.
[v] Vol. iv. p. 226. [w] P. 287.
[x] P. 321. [y] P. 442, 443.

'writes in the sixth book of his Institutions, and also Papias, 'bishop of Hierapolis. Peter also makes mention of this 'Mark in his epistle written at Rome, which he figuratively 'calls Babylon—Taking the gospel which himself had 'composed, he went to Egypt, and at Alexandria founded 'a church of great note.—He died in the eighth year of 'Nero, and was buried at Alexandria; where he was suc-'ceeded as bishop by Anianus.'

In the prologue to his commentary upon St. Matthew, Jerom says: 'The[z] second evangelist is Mark, interpreter 'of the apostle Peter, and the first bishop of Alexandria: 'who never saw the Lord himself, but related things as he 'had them from his master very truly, but not exactly in 'the order in which they were done.'

In his commentary upon Philem. ver. 24, he says, 'He[a] 'thinks that Mark there mentioned is the writer of the 'gospel.' That Mark may be well supposed to be John Mark, mentioned in the Acts, and in Col. iv. 10, where he is styled nephew to Barnabas. Whether that Mark was the evangelist was doubted of by some; nor was Jerom positive: but he was inclined to think him the same.

Augustine[b] calls Mark and Luke disciples of apostles; and says, that[c] Mark follows Matthew as his abridger: upon which some remarks were[d] made.

By Chrysostom[e] Mark is said to have written his gospel in Egypt, at the request of the believers there. However, at the end of that passage he says: 'In[f] what place each 'one of the evangelists wrote, cannot be said with cer-'tainty.' He likewise[g] calls Mark disciple of Peter, and Peter his master. He must have supposed him the same that is mentioned, 1 Peter v. 13. But I do not recollect him to have any where said that he was the same as John Mark.

Victor, writer of a commentary upon St. Mark's gospel, about the year 401, says: 'He[h] was also called John: that 'he wrote a gospel after Matthew, and was the son of 'Mary, mentioned, Acts xii. For a while he accompanied 'Paul, and his relation Barnabas: but when he came to 'Rome, he joined Peter, and accompanied him. For which 'reason he is mentioned, 1 Pet. v. 13. Mark is also men-'tioned by Paul, Col. iv. 10; 2 Tim. iv. 11.—When he 'was obliged to go from Rome, and was earnestly desired 'by the believers there to write a history of the preaching

[z] P. 439. [a] P. 443. [b] P. 501.
[c] P. 502. [d] P. 504. [e] P. 538.
[f] P. 539. [g] P. 540. [h] P. 582, 583.

'of the heavenly doctrine, he readily complied. This, as 'he adds, is said to have been the occasion of writing the 'gospel according to Mark.'

Cosmas of Alexandria, about 535, says: 'Mark, [i] the 'second evangelist, wrote a gospel at Rome, by the di-'rection of Peter.'

By Isidore of Seville, about 596, Mark [k] is said to have written his gospel in Italy. Afterwards he seems to say, it [l] was written at Alexandria: but perhaps no more is meant than that Mark preached at Alexandria the gospel which he had written.

Œcumenius, about 950, upon Acts xiii. 13, says: 'This '[m] John, who is also called Mark, nephew to Barnabas, 'wrote the gospel according to him, and was also disciple 'of Peter, of whom he says in his first epistle, Mark, my 'son, saluteth you.'

Theophylact flourished about 1070. His preface to St. Mark is to this purpose; 'The [n] gospel according to Mark 'was written at Rome ten years after Christ's ascension, at 'the request of the believers there. For this Mark was a 'disciple of Peter, whom he calls his son spiritually. His 'name was John. He was nephew to Barnabas, and was 'also a companion of Paul.'

Euthymius, about 1110, says: 'The [o] gospel of Mark 'was written about ten years after our Lord's ascension, at 'Rome, as some say, or in Egypt, according to others.' He says, 'that at first Mark was much with his uncle Bar-'nabas, and Paul. Afterwards he was with Peter at 'Rome, as the first epistle of the apostle shows, whom he 'there calls his son: from whom also he received the whole 'history of the gospel.'

Nicephorus Callisti, about 1325, says: 'Two [p] only of 'the twelve, Matthew and John, have left memoirs of our 'Lord's life on earth; and two of the seventy, Mark and 'Luke.' And somewhat lower: 'After this, Mark and 'Luke published their gospels by the direction of Peter 'and Paul.'

I add here one author more, not particularly mentioned in the preceding part of this work, Eutychius, patriarch of Alexandria, in the tenth century: who says, 'that [q] in the 'time of the emperor Nero, Peter, the prince of the apostles,

[i] Vol. v. p. 94 [k] P. 137. [l] P. 140.
[m] P. 155. [n] P. 159. [o] P. 165. [p] P. 167, 168.
[q] Et tempore Neronis Cæsaris scripsit Petrus apostolorum princeps, evangelium Marci, dictante Marco, linguâ Romanâ, in urbe Romæ; sed attribuit illud Marco. Eutych. ann. p. 335. Conf. ejusd. Origenes, p. 35.

'making use of the pen of Mark, wrote a gospel at Rome, 'in the Roman language; and he published it under 'Mark's name.' By the Roman, probably, meaning the Greek language, which then very much prevailed in the Roman empire, as [r] Selden has observed.

V. Let us now briefly recollect what has passed before us, in several articles.

1. All the ancient writers in general suppose the evangelist Mark to have been a companion of Peter in the latter part of his life, and to have had great advantages from that apostle's preaching, for composing a gospel.

2. Though some have doubted who Mark was, many have been of opinion, that he was John Mark, son of Mary, a pious Jewish woman, and an early believer, of Jerusalem, and nephew to Barnabas.

3. If Mark the evangelist be John Mark, as seems to me very probable, he was well acquainted with Barnabas and Paul, and other apostles and disciples, eye-witnesses of Jesus, beside Peter.

4. Some of the ancient writers, quoted by us, thought Mark to have been one of Christ's seventy disciples: which, I apprehend, cannot be either affirmed, or denied, with certainty. But, if he was not one of them, he was an early believer, and an early disciple and companion of apostles, and intimately conversant with them: whereby, and by hearing Peter preach in Judea, and other places, and lastly at Rome, he was well qualified to write a gospel.

S. Basnage has some observations upon this point, which deserve to be taken notice of. 'Epiphanius,[s] and the 'author of the Dialogue against the Marcionites, suppose 'Mark to have been one of Christ's seventy disciples. But 'that opinion, says he, does not appear to me well grounded. 'It seems incredible, that Peter should call Mark his son, 'if he was one of the seventy, who had a commission from 'Christ himself, and were almost equal to apostles. That

[r] Vid. Selden in Eutych. Origin. not. 28. p. 152.

[s] Marcum de lxx. discipulis unum fuisse, credidit Epiphanius—Nobis tamen non arridet ea sententia; cum incredibile sit, Petrum Marco filii nomen addidisse, si de septuaginta discipulis unus fuisset, quos Christus ipse legaverat, quique ab omni fere parte æquales erant apostolis. Papias quoque, vetustus ille auctor, lxx. discipulis Marcum eximit—Ex Tertulliano quoque scimus, Marcum interpretis officio functum fuisse, quod infra lxx. dignitatem fuit.—Neque lxx. discipulis eum apposuit Origenes, cujus non minimi ponderis est testimonium—Nobis tamen est admodum probabile, Marcum unum fuisse quingentorum fratrum, qui Christum a morte revocatum contemplati sunt; cuique, ut testi oculato, commissa est scribendi evangelii provincia. Basn. ann. 66. num. xvii.

'ancient writer, Papias, excludes him from that number, 'saying, that Mark was not a hearer or follower of the 'Lord.—And Tertullian calls Mark Peter's interpreter, 'which office would be below the character of one of the 'seventy—Nor does Origen make him one of the seventy, 'whose authority must be of great weight—However, it 'seems to me very probable, that Mark was one of the five 'hundred brethren, who saw Christ after his resurrection: 'and having been an eye-witness of that, he was qualified 'to write a gospel.'

Upon which I observe: the supposition, that Mark might be one of the five hundred spoken of by St. Paul, I Cor. xv. 6, is a mere conjecture, without any authority, either in scripture or antiquity. But I would add a thought or two for strengthening the argument, that Mark was not one of the seventy disciples. Eusebius,[t] in his Ecclesiastical History, has a chapter concerning the disciples of our Saviour; but Mark is not there named as one of them: nor does Jerom say any thing of it in his book of Illustrious Men, nor elsewhere, that I remember. The silence of Origen, Eusebius, and Jerom, upon this head, must amount to an argument of no small weight, that there was not in their times any prevailing tradition, that Mark was one of the seventy. It may be also reckoned an argument, that he was not of that number, in that he has not in his gospel taken any notice of them, or of the commission given to them: which is in St. Luke only, ch. x. 1—17.

I therefore conclude with saying, that Mark was an early believer, and an early disciple and fellow-labourer of apostles. But that he ever saw or heard the Lord Jesus is not certain.

5. The general account of the above-named writer is, that Mark wrote his gospel at Rome. In this there is a remarkable agreement, with a very few exceptions. Chrysostom indeed speaks of its being written in Egypt; but he is almost singular. That it was written at Rome, or in Italy, is said not only by Epiphanius, Jerom, Gregory Nazianzen, Victor, and divers others; but the Egyptian writers likewise all along say the same thing: that it was written by Mark at Rome, in the company of the apostle Peter. So say Clement of Alexandria, Athanasius, the supposed author of the Synopsis of scripture, Cosmas, and Eutychius, all of Alexandria. Ebedjesu likewise, in his catalogue of Syrian writings, says, that Mark wrote at Rome. And the Latin author of the commentary upon

[t] H. E. l. 1. cap. xii.

St. Mark's gospel, quoted some while ago, says, that it was written in Italy.

6. This leads us to think, that St. Mark's gospel was not written before the year 63, or 64. For we cannot perceive any good reason to think, that St. Peter was at Rome, till about that time. And this date is supported by the testimony of that ancient writer Irenæus, that Mark published his gospel after the decease of Peter and Paul.

VI. These are observations which the above-cited testimonies seem naturally to afford. But before we proceed any farther, it will be fit for us to take notice of the sentiments of learned moderns concerning the time of St. Mark's writing his gospel.

Cave supposes St. Mark to have published his gospel at Rome, in the year of Christ 65. His argument for it I place [u] below.

Mr. Jones's opinion was, that [v] this gospel was published between the year 64 and 67, or 68: when, according to his computation, Peter and Paul suffered martyrdom.

J. A. Fabricius [w] was for the year of Christ 63, the ninth of Nero.

Mill says, that [x] St. Mark published his gospel at Rome, in the year of Christ 63, after that the apostles Peter and Paul had been gone from thence, as Irenæus says.

But here I beg leave to observe, that, probably, Irenæus does not speak of these two apostles' removal from Rome, but of their decease. Secondly, Dr. Mill has no reason to suppose that Peter was at Rome during the time of Paul's two years' imprisonment there, especially at the period of

[u] Rogatus Romæ a fratribus, scripsit evangelium, a Petro approbatum. idque Græco sermone Romanis satis familiari. Factum id circa ann. 65, Petro et Paulo jam morte sublatis. Cum enim illum epistolâ secundâ ad Timotheum, non longe ante martyrium scriptâ Romam accersiverat Paulus, probabile est, Marcum vel eodem, vel saltem sequenti anno, illuc venisse, ibique evangelium vel primum condidisse, vel prius conditum in publicum edidisse. Certe Irenæus, l. 3. cap. i. et apud Eusebium, l. 5. c. viii. S. Marcus μετα την τετων εξοδον evangelium suum conscripsisse diserte tradit. Cav. H. L. T. i. p. 24.

[v] Mr. Jones's words are these: 'These, with some other reasons, make it 'evident to me, that St. Peter was not at Rome, till the year of Christ 63, or '64, and consequently that the gospel of St. Mark was not written before 'this time, but between that and the martyrdom of this apostle and St. Paul, 'in the year of Christ 67 or 68.' New and full Method, vol. iii. p. 88.

[w] Bib. Gr. l. 4. cap. v. tom. iii. p. 124, et 131.

[x] Post Pauli ac Petri εξοδον, seu discessum ab urbe Româ—"Marcus discipulus et interpres Petri, et ipse quæ a Petro annuntiata erant, perscripta nobis tradidit." Inquit Irenæus—Scripsit igitur Marcus evangelium, juxta Irenæum, paullo post horum duorum apostolorum discessum a Româ, qui accidisse videtur anno æræ vulgaris lxiii. Mill. Proleg. num. 101.

it; but there is a great deal of reason to think otherwise: for we have several epistles of St. Paul, written near the end of that confinement, in which no notice is taken of Peter.

Basnage [y] closely following Irenæus, says, Mark's gospel was published in the year 66, after the decease of Peter and Paul: whose martyrdoms, according to him, happened in [z] the year 65.

So that it has been of late the opinion of many learned men of the best judgment in these matters, that St. Mark's gospel was not published till after the year of Christ 60. I readily assent to them so far. And as I am disposed to place the martyrdoms of these two great apostles at Rome, in the latter part of the year 64, or in 65, it seems to me probable, that St. Mark's gospel was composed in the year 64, or 65, and made public by him the first fair opportunity, soon afterwards, before the end of the year 65. That I mention as the latest date. I do not presume to say the time exactly; for it might be finished and published in the year 64.

I hoped to have had assistance from Mr. Wetstein in this disquisition, but have been somewhat disappointed. In his preface to St. Mark's gospel he concludes from Col. iv. 10, and Philem. ver. 24, that [a] St. Mark had been with the apostle Paul at Rome, in the time of his confinement there: that from thence he went to Colosse, and afterwards returned to Rome, where he is said to have written his gospel. Accordingly, as one would think, St. Mark's gospel could not be published before the year 64, or 65. But in his preface to St. Luke's gospel the same learned writer expresseth himself to this purpose: 'According [b] to some ecclesiastical writers Luke published his gospel fifteen, according to others two and twenty, years after Christ's ascension.—That he transcribed many things from Matthew, and yet more from Mark, is manifest.'

But if St. Luke wrote within two and twenty years after Christ's ascension, and transcribed a great deal from St.

[y] De Marci evangelio legimus apud Irenæum—'Post vero horum excessum'—Quæ traditio magis apud nos valet, quam alia quælibet de tempore editi a Marco evangelii chronologia. Basn. ann. 66. n. xii.

[z] Vid. ann. 65. num. ix.

[a] Inde Romam venit, Paulumque captivum invisit, Col. iv. 10; Philem. 24. Inde ad Colossenses abiit, a quibus rogatu Pauli Romam rediit, 2 Tim. iv. 11. ubi evangelium conscripsisse—dicitur. Wetsten. N. T. tom. i. p. 551.

[b] Evangelium autem edidit xv. aut secundum alios xxii. post Christi adscensionem annis—Lucam multa ex Matthæo, ex Marco plura descripsisse, ex collatione patet. Ib. p. 643.

Mark; St. Mark's gospel must have been first published, and very early. If St. Mark's gospel was not published till the year 64, and St. Luke transcribed from him, St. Luke could not write till a good while after two and twenty years from Christ's ascension. I do not perceive therefore that Mr. Wetstein had any determined opinion concerning the date of these two gospels. Nor can I, as yet, persuade myself, that any of the evangelists transcribed each other.

VII. I will now observe some characters of time in the gospel itself, like those before taken notice of in St. Matthew.

1. From chap. vii. 14—23, it appears, that St. Mark fully understood the spirituality of the doctrine of Christ, recommending righteousness and true holiness, without an obligation to Jewish ritual ordinances and appointments.

2. His history of the Greek or Gentile woman, in the same chap. vii. 24—30, who besought Jesus to heal her daughter, and obtained her request, deserves notice here.

3. The call of the Gentiles, and the rejection of the Jews, as a people, are intimated in ch. xii. 1—12, in the parable there recorded of the householder, who planted a vineyard, and let it out to husbandmen: to whom after a while he sent servants, and then his son, to receive from them the fruit of the vineyard. But they abused the servants, and killed the son. It is added, "What therefore will the Lord of the vineyard do? He will destroy the husbandmen, and will let out the vineyard unto others." And what follows.

4. In ch. xiii. are predictions concerning the destruction of the temple, and the desolations of the Jewish people. And, particularly, at ver. 14—16, are remarkable expressions, intimating the near approach of those calamities, and suited to excite the attention of such as were in danger of being involved in them.

5. In his account of the institution of the eucharist, our Lord says, ch. xiv. 24, "This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many:" that is, for all men, not for Jews only, but for Gentiles also.

6. In ch. iv. 30—32, is the parable of the "grain of mustard-seed, the least of all seeds, which becometh greater than all herbs:" representing the swift and wonderful progress of the gospel in the world: of which, it is very likely, St. Mark, at the time of writing, had some knowledge.

7. It is manifest, that he well understood the extent of

our Saviour's commission to the twelve apostles: for he has recorded it in these words, ch. xvi. 15, "Go ye therefore into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature:" or the whole creation, that is, Jews and Gentiles, all mankind of every denomination.

8. Yea, it appears from the conclusion of his history, that before he wrote, the apostles (at least divers of them) had left Judea, and had preached in many places. Ver. 20, "And they went forth, and preached every where, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following."

9. Ch. xvi. 18, "They shall take up serpents." Some may think, that here is a reference to the history, which we have in Acts xxviii. 3—6. I do not say there is. But allowing it, I should not reckon it an objection to the genuineness of this part of that chapter: it would only be an argument for the late date of this gospel; and it has been so understood by [c] some. For my own part, I cannot say, that St. Mark has referred to it. But I make no question, that he was acquainted with the event there related, when he wrote his gospel.

VIII. I shall conclude this chapter with some observations upon St. Mark's gospel.

1. It confirms the accounts given by the ancients, that it is the substance of Peter's preaching. This was taken notice of just now in our recollection; but I choose to enlarge upon it here, and show, that the gospel itself affords evidences of its being written according to that apostle's discourses, or according to informations and directions given by him to this evangelist.

1.) In the first place, I would here remind my readers of a long passage of Eusebius, the learned bishop of Cæsarea, formerly transcribed, of which I take here a very small part only.

Having observed several things very honourable to Peter related in the other gospels, he adds: 'Though [d] such 'things were said to Peter by Jesus, Mark has taken no 'notice of them: because, as is probable, Peter did not

[c] Postremo, in ipsis evangeliis quædam exstare videntur criteria, ex quibus ea sero esse conscripta colligi potest. Phrasis μεχρι της σημερον, 'usque ad hunc diem,' Matt. xxviii. 15, justum spatium inter Christi resurrectionem et evangelium exaratum postulare videtur. Ita quæ Marcus, cap. xvi. 18, de serpentibus a Christi discipulis sine damno tollendis habet, ad Paulum, Romam tendentem, et quod ei in itinere in insulâ Mileto contigit, respicere videntur. Herman. Venema Diss. secund. de titulo ep. ad Ephes. cap. v. num. iv.

[d] Vol. iv. p. 93.

'relate them in his sermons. For he did not think fit to 'bear testimony to himself by relating what Jesus said to 'him, or of him; therefore Mark has omitted them. But 'what concerned his denial of Jesus, he preached to all 'men, because he wept bitterly—For all things in Mark are 'said to be memoirs of Peter's discourses.'

2.) And [e] Chrysostom, reconciling Matthew's and Mark's accounts of Peter's denying Christ, says: 'These things 'Mark had from his master; for he was a disciple of Peter. 'And what is very remarkable, though he was a disciple 'of Peter, he relates his fall more particularly than any of 'the rest.'

3.) The [f] same great preacher explaining the history of our Lord's paying the didrachm or tribute-money to the temple, which is in Matt. xvii. 24—27, and particularly those words: "That take, and give unto them for me and thee," says, 'Mark, who was a disciple of Peter, omits this, 'because it was honourable to that apostle. But he re-'lates the history of his denial of Christ. And perhaps his 'master forbid him to insert such things, as tended to ag-'grandize him.'

4.) No one has more largely treated this point than Mr. Jones, who has [g] a catalogue of several places in the gospels, containing things tending to Peter's honour, which are not mentioned in St. Mark's gospel.

(1.) The account of Christ's pronouncing Peter blessed, when he had confessed him: Christ's declaring, that he had his faith and knowledge from God: the promise of the keys, and of that large power, which is made to him: are omitted by St. Mark, though the former and the succeeding parts of this discourse are both told by him. See Matt. xvi. 16—20, compared with Mark viii. 29, 30.

(2.) The relation of St. Peter's being commissioned by Christ to work the miracle, by getting money out of the fish's mouth to pay the tribute-money, is told by St. Matthew, ch. xvii. 24—28, but omitted by St. Mark: though the preceding and subsequent stories are the very same as in St. Matthew. See Mark ix. 30—33.

(3.) Christ's particular expressions of love and favour to St. Peter, in telling him of his danger, and that he prayed particularly for him, that his faith might not fail, is omitted by St. Mark, but related, Luke xxii. 31, 32.

(4.) St. Peter's remarkable humility above the rest of the apostles expressed in an unwillingness, that Christ

[e] Vol. iv. ch. cxviii. num. v. 4.
[f] Ibid.
[g] See New and full Method, part 3. p. 79—81.

should wash his feet, which none of the rest did express, with Christ's particular discourse to him, John xiii. 6, &c. is omitted by Mark.

(5.) The instance of St. Peter's very great zeal for Christ, when he was taken, in cutting off the high-priest's servant's ear, John xviii. 10, is not mentioned by Mark in particular, but only told in general, of a certain person that stood by. Mark xiv. 47.

(6.) St. Peter's faith in casting himself into the sea, to go to Christ, John xxi. 7, is not mentioned by St. Mark.[h]

(7.) Christ's discourse with Peter concerning his love to him, and his particular repeated charge to him, to feed his sheep, John xxi. 15, is omitted by St. Mark.

(8.) Our Saviour's predicting to Peter his martyrdom, and the manner of it, John xxi. 18, 19, is not related by St. Mark.

'These, adds that diligent author, are some instances of 'things, tending to St. Peter's honour, recorded by the 'other evangelists, none of which are so much as hinted by 'St. Mark.—All which cannot be accounted for any way 'more probable, than supposing that this apostle did not 'publish those circumstances, which were so much to his 'honour.'

Indeed, I think, they do confirm the accounts given of this gospel by the ancients. For these omissions cannot be so well ascribed to any thing, as to St. Peter's modesty and reservedness, who had not mentioned such things in his preaching, and discouraged the putting them down in writing: insomuch, that, as Tertullian says, the[i] gospel published by Mark may be said to be Peter's.

5.) Nevertheless, I must acknowledge, that there are some things in St. Mark's gospel honourable to Peter, which are not in any other: I shall mention two or three.

Says St. Mark, ch. i. 36, "And Simon, and they that were with him, followed after him." If thereby be intended the whole company of the apostles, that way of describing them is very honourable to Peter. But some may suppose none to be intended, beside those mentioned, ver. 29. If so, it resembles Luke ix. 32, "But Peter, and they that were with him:" meaning John and James, and referring to ver. 28.

In Mark xiv. 3, Peter is mentioned as one of the four

[h] There is a like thing, and more extraordinary, related by Matthew only, ch. xiv. 28—31. I do not know why Mr. Jones omitted it.

[i] See Vol. ii. p. 276.

apostles to whom our Lord addressed himself, when he foretold the destruction of the temple, and the calamities attending it: which is a passage peculiar to St. Mark.

And ch. xvi. 7. The message, which the angels sent to the disciples by the women at the sepulchre, is thus expressed: "But go your way. Tell his disciples, and Peter, that he goes before you into Galilee." Peter is not mentioned, upon this occasion, by Matthew xxviii. 7, nor by any other of the evangelists.

Upon this text Whitby says very well: 'Peter is here 'named, not as prince of the apostles, but, as the fathers 'say, for his consolation, and to take off the scruple which 'might be upon his spirit: whether, by his three-fold denial 'of his master, he had not forfeited his right to be one of 'Christ's disciples.'

I now proceed to another observation.

2. St. Mark's gospel, as is evident to all, is the shortest of the four. Jerom, as before cited, says, Mark[k] wrote a short gospel. And Chrysostom observed, that[l] Mark had the conciseness of Peter, following his Master.

3. Nevertheless there are in St. Mark many things peculiar to himself, not mentioned by any other evangelist.

I shall here put down several such things, and not those which are omitted by Matthew, but such things as are in Mark, and in no other of the evangelists.

1.) In the account of our Saviour's temptation in the wilderness, St. Mark says, ch. i. 13, "and was with the wild beasts:" not mentioned by any other evangelist, and yet very proper to show the hardships which our Lord underwent at that season.

2.) Ch. i. 20. In the account of the call of James and John, the sons of Zebedee, he says, "they left their father in the ship, with the hired servants:" a circumstance not mentioned by any other.

3.) Ch. i. 29, "And forthwith, when they were come out of the synagogue, they entered into the house of Simon, and Andrew, with James and John." In Matt. viii. 14, it is only, "come into Peter's house." In Luke iv. 38, "And entered into Simon's house."

4.) Ch. i. 33, "And all the city was gathered together at the door." Not in any other evangelist. Compare Matt. viii. 16; Luke iv. 40, 41.

5.) Ch. i. 35, "And in the morning rising up a great while before day, he went out, and departed into a solitary place, and there prayed." Ver. 36, "And Simon, and they

[k] See here, p. 334.

[l] See Vol. v. ch. cxviii. num. v. 10.

that were with him, followed after him." Ver. 37, "And when they had found him, they said unto him: All men seek thee." This is not at all in Matthew, and is here much fuller, and with more particulars, than in Luke iv. 42.

6.) Ch. i. 45, Of the leper, cured by our Saviour, he says: "But he went out, and began to publish it much, and to blaze abroad the matter." Not particularly mentioned by the other evangelists. Compare Matth. viii. 4; Luke v. 14, 15.

7.) In the cure of the paralytic, ch. ii. 2, "And straightway many were gathered together, insomuch that there was no room to receive them, not so much as about the door. 3. And they come unto him, bringing one sick of the palsy, which was borne of four. 4. And—they uncovered the roof"—No other evangelist has so particularly described the crowd. In Mark only it is said, that this sick man was borne of four. He likewise more particularly describes the uncovering the roof. Compare Matt. ix. 1, 2; Luke v. 18, 19.

8.) In the history of the man "with a withered hand," cured in the synagogue, on a sabbath; ch. iii. 5, "And when he had looked round about on them with anger, being grieved for the hardness of their hearts, he saith unto the man: Stretch forth thy hand." Not so full in any other evangelist. Compare Matt. xii. 9—13; Luke vi. 6—11.

9.) Ch. iii. ver. 6, "And the pharisees went forth, and straightway took counsel with the Herodians against him." Matt. xii. 14, mentions pharisees only. Luke vi. 11, mentions no persons by name.

10.) Ch. iii. 17, And James the son of Zebedee, and John the brother of James; and he named them Boanerges." Not in any other evangelist.

11.) Ch. iii. 19—"And they went into the house. 20. And the multitude cometh together again, so that they could not so much as eat bread. 21. And when his friends heard of it, they went out to lay hold of him. For they said: He is beside himself." Whether that expression "he is beside himself" is to be understood of Christ, or of the multitude, this passage is peculiar to St. Mark.

12.) Ch. iv. 26, "And he said: So is the kingdom of God, as if a man should cast his seed into the ground, 27. And should sleep, and rise night and day, and the seed should spring and grow up, he knoweth not how. 28. For the earth bringeth forth fruit of itself, first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear. 29. But when

the fruit is ripe, immediately he putteth in the sickle, because the harvest is come." This parable is peculiar to St. Mark. See Whitby upon the place, and likewise [m] Grotius.

13.) After the parable of the grain of mustard-seed, beside other things common to him and Matthew, he adds, ch. iv. 34, "And when they were alone, he expounded all things to his disciples." Compare Matt. xiii. 31—34. This particular leads us mightily to think, that either Mark was an eye-witness, or had the best and fullest information of things.

14.) Mark iv. 36, "And when they had sent away the multitude, they took him even as he was in the ship." This circumstance, peculiar to St. Mark, enables us to account for our Lord's fast sleep in his passage to the country of the Gadarenes. We perceive from St. Mark, that this voyage was undertaken in the evening, after the fatigue of long discourses in public, and without any refreshment. Our Lord's sleep in the midst of a storm is mentioned by all three evangelists. Matt. viii. 24—26; Mark iv. 37, 38; Luke viii. 23, 24. But this evangelist alone leads us to discern the occasion of it.

15.) Farther, in the same ver. 36, of ch. iv. "And there were also with him several other little ships." A particular peculiar to St. Mark.

16.) And in the account of this voyage across the sea, he says, ver. 38, that our Lord was "in the hinder part of the ship, asleep on a pillow:" two circumstances, wanting in the other evangelists.

17.) Certainly these and other things are sufficient to assure us, that either Mark was an eye-witness: or, that he wrote things as related to him by an eye-witness, even Peter himself, as all the ancients say.

18.) In Matt. viii. 28—34; Mark v. 1—19; Luke viii. 26—39, are the several accounts of our Lord's healing the dæmoniac, or dæmoniacs, in the country of the Gadarenes; for Matthew speaks of two, Mark and Luke of one only. In St. Mark's history are divers things not in the other gospels. In him alone it is said, that "the man was always night and day in the mountains, and in the tombs, crying, and cutting himself with stones." And he only mentions the number of swine that perished in the sea, saying, "they were about two thousand."

[m] Hæc parabola, aliis omissa, cum suam hic explicationem non habeat, explicari debet ex simili comparatione, quæ est apud Matt. xiii. 24. Grot. ad Marc. iv. 26.

19.) All the first three evangelists have given a history of our Lord's raising the daughter of Jairus, and healing the woman with an issue of blood, both in connection. Matt. ix. 18—26; Mark v. 22—43; Luke viii. 41—56. St. Mark has several things which are in neither of the other. Of the woman he says, ver. 26, "she had suffered much of many physicians—and was nothing bettered, but rather grew worse." At ver. 29, "And she felt in her body, that she was healed of that plague." At ver. 41, he inserts the very words which Jesus spake when he raised the daughter of Jairus: "Talitha Kumi." I have omitted some other things peculiar to St. Mark in the account of these two miracles.

20.) Ch. vi. 13, In the account of the commission given to the twelve by Christ in his life-time, he says, "they anointed many with oil, and healed them:" which is mentioned by no other evangelist, as was observed of old by [n] Victor.

21.) Mark vii. 2, 3, 4. What is there said of the Jews' washing themselves, when they come from the market, before they eat: and of their cleansing cups, pots, brazen vessels, and tables," is peculiar to St. Mark. Comp. Matt. xv. 1, 2.

22.) Ch. vii. 21, 22, Are the things that defile men. St. Matthew, ch. xv. 19, mentions seven things only. St. Mark has thirteen: and two of them, "an evil eye," and "foolishness," are very singular.

23.) Ch. vii. 31—37, Our Lord bestows hearing and speech upon a deaf and dumb man.

24.) Ch. viii. 22—26, Our Lord cures a blind man at Bethsaida.

These two miracles are peculiar to St. Mark, being related by no other evangelist.

25.) Ch. x. 46—52, is the account of the miracle on the blind man near Jericho. St. Mark, ver. 46, calls him blind Bartimeus, son of Timæus: not mentioned by the other evangelists. See Matt. xx. 29—34; Luke xviii. 35—43. And at ver. 50, "he, casting away his garment, rose, and came to Jesus:" a circumstance peculiar to St. Mark. Which shows his exact knowledge of the history, as did likewise calling the man by his name.

26.) Ch. xi. 13, "For the time of figs was not yet:" that is, the time of gathering was not yet come. A most useful observation peculiar to this evangelist, showing, that as there were leaves, it was reasonable to expect fruit on this

[n] See Vol. iv. ch. cxxii. 12.

fig-tree, if it was not barren. Upon this text might be consulted [o] bishop Kidder, and [p] Mr. Hallet.

27.) Ch. xiii. 3, 4, "And as he sat upon the mount of Olives, over against the temple, Peter, and James, and John, and Andrew, asked him privately,—When shall these things be?" No other evangelist has mentioned the names of the disciples, who put this question to our Saviour. Comp. Matt. xxiv. 1—3; Luke xxi. 5.

28.) In Mark. 41—44, and Luke xxi. 1—4, is the account of the people casting their gifts into the chests of the treasury in the temple. St. Mark says: "And Jesus sat over against the treasury." In which expression there is great propriety. And he alone mentions the value of the poor widow's two mites, saying, "which make a farthing."

29.) Ch. xiv. 51, "And there followed him a certain young man, having a linen cloth cast about his naked body. And the young men [the guards] laid hold on him." Ver. 52, "And he left the linen cloth, and fled from them naked." A particular in no other evangelist, yet very fitly taken notice of, as intimating the usual noise and disturbance, when a man is taken up in the night-time as a malefactor, and is carried before a magistrate. By [q] the noise of the people passing along, that young person was excited to come hastily out of the house where he was, to inquire what was the matter. Mr. Le Clerc, in his French Testament, has an useful note upon this place. He observes the natural simplicity of the evangelist's narration; which, as he justly says, confirms the truth of their history.

30.) Ch. xv. 21, "And they compel one Simon, a Cyrenian, who passed by, coming out of the country, the father of Alexander and Rufus, to bear his cross." That particular, "the father of Alexander and Rufus," is in no other evangelist. Comp. Matt. xxvii. 32, and Luke xxiii. 26.

31.) Ch. xvi. 3, 4, "And they said among themselves, Who shall roll us away the stone from the door of the sepulchre: for it was very great." In no other evangelist.

32.) Ch. xvi. 7, "But go your way, tell his disciples, and Peter, that he goes before you into Galilee." The mention of Peter is peculiar to St. Mark. For in Matt. xxviii. 7, it is, "Go quickly, and tell his disciples." St. Luke has not recorded that message.

[o] Demonstration of the Messiah, Part ii. ch. ii. p. 38, 39.

[p] Notes and Discourses, Vol. ii. p. 114—125.

[q] Non de apostolorum grege—sed ex villâ aliquâ horto proximâ, strepitu militum excitatus, et subito accurrens, ut conspiceret quid ageretur. Grot. ad Marc. xi. 51.

33.) I add nothing more of this kind. I have omitted many things, which are in this gospel, and no other, being apprehensive, that if I enlarged farther, I should be charged with prolixity.

34.) The particulars that have been alleged, are sufficient to assure us, that St. Mark is not an epitomiser of another author: and that he was well acquainted with the things of which he undertook to write a history. He writes as an eye-witness, or as one who had full and authentic information at the first hand. In a word, St. Mark's gospel, though short, is a very valuable and masterly performance.

4. It may be proper for me to add one thing more: that I suppose the twelve verses at the end of the sixteenth chapter to be a genuine part of this gospel. If any doubt of it, I would refer them for their satisfaction to Dr. Mill, and to the observations of Grotius, at the beginning of that chapter, and to Beza upon the ninth verse. And for explaining those twelve verses, and reconciling them with the other evangelists, I refer to Grotius, and other commentators.

CHAP. VIII.

ST. LUKE, EVANGELIST.

I. *His history from the N. T.* II. *Testimonies of ancient christian writers to St. Luke, and his two books, his gospel, and the Acts.* III. *Remarks upon those Testimonies.* IV. *The time of writing his gospel and the Acts.* V. *Internal characters of time in the gospel.* VI. *The place where it was written.* VII. *A general recollection of St. Luke's character.* VIII. *Observations upon his gospel.* IX. *Observations upon the book of the Acts.*

I. THE first time that we find any mention of St. Luke in the books of the New Testament is in his[a] own history.

[a] From some words in the Cambridge manuscript, Bp. Pearson has argued that Luke was in Paul's company from the year 43. Dein peragrat [Paulus] Phrygiam et Galatiam, et per Mysiam venit Troadem, ubi se illi comitem adjunxisse indicat Lucas, xvi. 10, qui antea etiam Antiochiæ cum Paulo fuit, et jam cum Troade assecutus est: ut colligere licet ex Act. xi. 28. ubi Codex Cantabr. habet, *συνεστραμμενων δε ἡμων*. Ab anno igitur 43, per octennium

Acts xvi. 10, 11. Whereby it appears, that he was in Paul's company at Troas, before the apostle took shipping to go into Macedonia: in which voyage St. Luke was one of the company, ver. 8, "And they, passing by Mysia, came to Troas." Ver. 9, "And a vision appeared to Paul in the night: There stood a man of Macedonia, and prayed him, saying, Come over into Macedonia, and help us." Ver. 10, "And when he had seen the vision, immediately we endeavoured to go into Macedonia, assuredly gathering, that the Lord had called us to preach the gospel to them." Ver. 11, "Therefore loosing from Troas, we came with a straight course to Samothracia."

In that journey St. Paul went from Samothracia to Neapolis, and thence to Philippi, 11—17. So far St. Luke speaks in the first person plural. But having finished his account of the transactions at Philippi, which reaches to ver. 40, the last of that chapter: at the beginning of the next ch. xvii. 1, he [b] changeth the person, and says: "Now when they had passed through Amphipolis, and Apollonia, they came to Thessalonica, where was a synagogue of the Jews."

Nor does he any more expressly speak of himself, until Paul was a second time in Greece, and was setting out for Jerusalem with the collections, which had been made for the poor saints in Judea, Acts xx. 1—6, "And after the

discipulus fuerat Antiochiæ. Annal. Paulin. p. 10. But it is not safe to rely upon one manuscript only, different from all others, and of no great authority. As Mr. Tillemont took notice of this observation of Pearson, I transcribe his thoughts about it. Selon le manuscrit de Cambridge, S. Luc dit qu'il étoit avec S. Paul à Antioche, dès l'an 43: ce que Pearson a reçu. Mais il ne seroit pas sûr de fier à un manuscrit différent de tous les autres. Et quand cela se pourroit en quelques occasions, ce ne seroit pas à l'égard du manuscrit de Cambridge, qui est plein d'additiones et altérations contraires au véritable texte de S. Luc. Mem. Ec. T. 2. S. Luc. note iii. Some may argue from these words, that Luke was a Gentile, converted by Paul at Antioch. And others might argue that he is the same as Lucius, mentioned, Acts xiii. 1. But I should think it best for neither side to form an argument from this reading. Mr. Wetstein has referred us to a place of St. Augustine, where this text is quoted very agreeably to the Cambridge manuscript. In illis autem diebus descenderunt ab Jerosolymis prophetæ Antiochiam. Congregatis autem nobis, surgens unus ex illis, nomine Agabus, &c. De Serm. Dom. l. 2. c. 17. But it is observable, that Irenæus, l. 3. c. 14. init. a more ancient writer, enumerating St. Luke's journeys in St. Paul's company, begins at Troas. Acts xvi. 8—10. I presume, it must be best to rely upon him, and the general consent of all manuscripts, except one, in the common reading.

[b] Nevertheless it is supposed by many, that Luke continued with Paul. Irenæus calls him Paul's inseparable companion, after his coming to be with the Apostle at Troas. Adv. H. l. 3. c. 14. So likewise Cave. Cujus perinde sectator erat, et omnis peregrinationis comes. H. L. T. 1. p. 25. See also Tillem. St. Luc. Mem. Ec. T. 2.

uproar" [at Ephesus] "was ceased, Paul called unto him the disciples and embraced them, and departed for to go into Macedonia. And when he had gone over those parts, and had given them much exhortation, he came into Greece, and there abode three months. And when the Jews laid wait for him, as he was about to sail into Syria, he purposed to return through Macedonia. And there accompanied him into Asia, Sopater of Berea.—These going before, tarried for us at Troas. And we sailed away from Philippi—and came unto them at Troas in five days, where we abode seven days." So that Luke accompanied Paul, at that time, from Greece through Macedonia to Philippi, and also went with him from thence to Troas.

And it appears from the sequel of the history in the Acts, that Luke was one of those, who accompanied the apostle to Jerusalem, and stayed with him there. And when the apostle was sent a prisoner from Cæsarea to Rome, he was in the same ship with him, and stayed with him at Rome during the whole time of his two years' imprisonment there, with which the history of the Acts concludes.

From St. Paul's epistles written at Rome, in the time of that confinement, we have proofs of Luke's being with him. He is mentioned as with the apostle, 2 Tim. iv. 11; an epistle written, as I suppose, in the summer after the apostle's arrival there. In Philem. ver. 24, he is one of those who send salutations to Philemon, and is mentioned by the apostle as one of his fellow-labourers. And, if Luke the beloved physician, mentioned, Col. iv. 14, be the evangelist, that is another proof of his being then with the apostle.

St. Luke is also supposed by some to be "the brother, whose praise is in the gospel throughout all the churches," 2 Cor. viii. 18, but that is not certain.

As I think, that all St. Paul's epistles, which we have, were written before he left Rome and Italy, when he had been sent thither by Festus, I must be of opinion, that the New Testament affords us not any materials for the history of St. Luke, lower than his own book of the Acts, which brings us down to the end of that period.

II. I now therefore proceed, without farther delay, to observe what light may be obtained from ancient christian writers. And as St. Luke's two books, his gospel and the Acts, were all along universally received; I intend here, for avoiding prolixity, to allege, chiefly, such passages only, as contain something relating to the his-

tory and character of St. Luke, or the time of writing his two above-named works.

Irenæus as before quoted: 'And[c] Luke the companion 'of Paul, put down in a book the gospel preached by him.' And the coherence seems to imply, that this was done after the writing of St. Mark's gospel, and after the death of Peter and Paul. In a passage formerly cited[d] at length, Irenæus shows from the Acts, as we did just now, that Luke attended Paul in several of his journies and voyages, and was his fellow-labourer in the gospel. He likewise says that[e] 'Luke was not only a companion, but also a fellow-'labourer of the apostles, especially of Paul.' Again, he calls him 'a[f] disciple and follower of the apostles.' 'The[g] 'apostles, he says, envying none, plainly delivered to all 'the things which they had learned from the Lord. So 'likewise Luke, envying no man, has delivered to us what 'he learned from them, as he says: "Even as they de-'livered them unto us, who from the beginning were eye-'witnesses and ministers of the word."' By all which it seems, that Irenæus reckoned Luke to have been a disciple of the apostles, not a hearer of Jesus Christ himself.

Clement of Alexandria has borne a large testimony to this gospel, and the Acts, as well as to the other books of the New Testament. And as we learn from Eusebius, 'in[h] his 'Institutions he mentions a tradition concerning the order 'of the gospels, which he had received from presbyters of 'more ancient times, and which is to this purpose. He says 'that the gospels containing the genealogies were written 'first:' according to that tradition therefore St. Matthew's and St. Luke's gospels were written before St. Mark's. Which, according to the same Clement and the tradition received by him, was written at Rome, at the request of Peter's hearers, or the christians in that city.

Tertullian[i] speaks of Matthew and John as disciples of Christ, of Mark and Luke as disciples of apostles: therefore I think he did not reckon these to have been of the seventy, or hearers of Christ. However, he ascribes a like authority to these, and says, 'that[k] the gospel which Mark 'published, may be said to be Peter's, whose interpreter

[c] Vol. ii. p. 170. [d] P. 173, 174.
[e] P. 174. [f] P. 173.
[g] Sic apostoli simpliciter, nemini invidentes quæ didicerant ipsi a Domino, hæc omnibus tradebant. Sic igitur et Lucas, nemini invidens, ea quæ ab eis didicerat, tradidit nobis, sicut ipse testatur dicens: Quemadmodum tradiderunt nobis qui ab initio contemplatores et ministri fuerunt verbi. Adv. H. l. 3. cap. 14. n. 2.
[h] Vol. ii. p. 225. [i] P. 278, 279. [k] P. 276

'Mark was. For Luke's digest also is often ascribed to 'Paul. And indeed it is easy to take that for the master's 'which the disciples published.' Again: 'Moreover[l] 'Luke was not an apostle, but apostolical; not a master, 'but a disciple: certainly less than his master, certainly so 'much later, as he is a follower of Paul, the last of the 'apostles.' This likewise shows Tertullian's notion of St. Luke's character.

Origen mentions the gospels in the order now generally received. 'The[m] third, says he, is that according to Luke, 'the gospel commended by Paul, published for the sake of 'the Gentile converts.' In his commentary upon the epistle to the Romans, which we now have in a Latin version only, he says, upon ch. xvi. 21, "Some[n] say Lucius is Lucas 'the evangelist, as indeed it is not uncommon to write 'names sometimes according to the original form, some-'times according to the Greek or Roman termination.' Lucius, mentioned in that text of the epistle to the Romans, must have been a Jew. Nevertheless, as Origen assures us, some thought him to be Luke the evangelist. The same observation we saw in[o] Sedulius, who wrote a commentary upon St. Paul's epistles, collected out of Origen and others.

Eusebius of Cæsarea, as transcribed formerly, speaking of St. Paul's fellow-labourers, says, 'And[p] Luke, who was 'of Antioch, and by profession a physician, for the most 'part a companion of Paul, who had likewise a more than 'slight acquaintance with the rest of the apostles, has left 'us in two books, divinely inspired, evidences of the art of 'healing souls, which he had learned from them. One of 'these is the gospel which he professeth to have written, as 'they delivered it to him, "who from the beginning were 'eye-witnesses and ministers of the word:" with all whom, 'he says likewise, he had been perfectly acquainted from 'the very first. The other is the Acts of the Apostles, which 'he composed now, not from what he had received by the 'report of others, but from what he had seen with his own 'eyes.' And in another place, cited[q] also formerly, he observes, 'that[r] Luke had delivered in his gospel a certain

[l] Vol. ii. p. 278, 279. [m] P. 494.

[n] Sed et Lucium quidam perhibent esse Lucam evangelistam, qui evangelium scripsit, pro eo quod soleant nomina interdum secundum patriam declinationem, interdum Græcam Romanamque, proferri. In Rom. T. 2. p. 632. Basil. 1571.

[o] Vol. v. p. 58. [p] Vol. iv. p. 100. [q] P. 96.

[r] —*Τον ασφαλη λογον ων αυτος ικανως την αληθειαν κατειληφει, εκ της αμα Παυλῳ συνουσιας τε και διατριβης, κα της των λοιπων αποσ-*

'account of such things, as he had been well assured of by 'his intimate acquaintance and familiarity with Paul, and 'his conversation with the other apostles.' From all which, I think it appears that Eusebius did not take Luke for a disciple of Christ, but of apostles only.

In the Synopsis, ascribed to Athanasius, it is said, 'that[s] 'the gospel of Luke was dictated by the apostle Paul, and 'written and published by the blessed apostle and physician 'Luke.'

The author of the Dialogue against the Marcionites, says, 'that[t] Mark and Luke were disciples of Christ, and of the 'number of the seventy.'

Epiphanius[u] speaks to the like purpose.

Gregory Nazianzen says, 'that[v] Luke wrote for the 'Greeks,' or in Achaia.

Gregory Nyssen says, 'that[w] Luke was as much a phy-'sician for the soul as for the body:' taking him to be the same that is mentioned, Col. iv. 14.

In the catalogue of Ebedjesu it is said 'that[x] Luke 'taught and wrote at Alexandria, in the Greek lan-'guage.'

The author of the Commentary upon St. Paul's thirteen epistles seems to have doubted whether[y] the evangelist Luke be the person intended, Col. iv. 14.

Jerom agrees very much with Eusebius, already transcribed: nevertheless I shall put down here somewhat largely what he says. 'Luke,[z] a physician of Antioch, not 'unskilful in the Greek language, a disciple of the apostle 'Paul, and the constant companion of his travels, wrote a 'gospel,—and another excellent volume, entitled the Acts 'of the Apostles.—It is supposed that Luke did not learn 'his gospel from the apostle Paul only, who had not con-'versed with the Lord in the flesh, but also from other 'apostles: which likewise he owns at the beginning of his 'volume, saying, "Even as they delivered them unto us, 'who from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers 'of the word." Therefore he wrote the gospel from the in-'formation of others: but the Acts he composed from his 'ow knowledge.' So writes Jerom in his Book of Illustrious Men.

In the prologue to his Commentary upon St. Matthew, he

τολων ὁμιλιας ὠφελημενος, ἑια τε ἰδιε παρεδωκεν εναγγελιε. H. E. l. 3. c. 24. p. 96. c.

[s] Vol. iv. p. 165. [t] P. 167. [u] P. 188.
[v] P. 287. [w] P. 296. [x] P. 321.
[y] P. 383, 384. [z] P. 443, 444.

says, 'The[a] third evangelist is Luke, the physician, a Syrian of Antioch, who was a disciple of the apostle Paul, and published his gospel in the countries of Achaia and Bæotia.'

He observes elsewhere, 'that[b] some said Luke had been a proselyte to judaism, before his conversion to christianity.' He speaks of St. Luke in many other places, which I need not now take notice of.

Augustine says, 'that[c] two of the evangelists, Matthew and John, were apostles—Mark and Luke disciples of apostles.'

Chrysostom in the Synopsis, probably his, says, 'Two[d] of the gospels were written by John and Matthew, Christ's disciples, the other two by Luke and Mark, of whom one was disciple of Peter, the other of Paul. The former conversed with Christ, and were eye-witnesses of what they wrote: the other two wrote what they had received from eye-witnesses.' And to the like purpose in[e] his first homily upon St. Matthew. Again he says, 'Luke[f] had the fluency of Paul, Mark the conciseness of Peter, both learning of their masters.' And upon Col. iv. 14, he says, this[g] is the evangelist.

Upon Col. iv. 14, Theodoret says, 'This[h] person wrote the divine gospel, and the history of the Acts.' He says the same upon[i] 2 Tim. iv. 11.

Paulinus[k] celebrates Luke, as having been first a physician of the body, then of the soul.

Here I would refer to the author of Quæstiones et Responsiones, probably written in the fifth century, who reckons both[l] the evangelists, writers of the genealogies, that is, Matthew and Luke, to have been Hebrews.

According to Euthalius,[m] Luke was a disciple of Paul, and a physician of Antioch.

Isidore of Seville says, 'Of[n] the four evangelists, the first and last relate what they had heard Christ say, or had seen him perform. The other two, placed between them, relate those things, which they had learned from apostles. Matthew wrote his gospel first in Judea; then Mark in Italy; Luke the third, in Achaia; John the last, in Asia.' In another place he says, 'Of[o] all the evan-

[a] P. 439. [b] P. 444. [c] P. 501.
[d] P. 537. [e] P. 538. [f] P. 541.
[g] Οὗτος ἐστιν ὁ εὐαγγελιστης. In Col. hom. 12. T. XI. p. 412.
[h] Vol. v. p. 17, 18. note.
[i] In 2 Tim. T. III. p. 505.
[k] Vol. iv. ch. cxiv. [l] Vol. ii. p. 129.
[m] Vol. v. p. 70. [n] P. 137. [o] P. 138.

'gelists Luke, the third in order is reckoned to have been 'the most skilful in the Greek tongue. For he was a phy-'sician, and wrote his gospel in Greece.'

In Theophylact are these things. In his preface to St. Matthew's gospel he says, 'that[p] there are four evan-'gelists, two of which, Matthew and John, were of the choir 'of the twelve apostles: the other two, Mark and Luke, 'were of the number of the seventy. Mark was a disciple 'and companion of Peter, Luke of Paul.—Luke wrote fif-'teen years after Christ's ascension.' In the preface to his Commentary upon St. Luke he says, 'that[q] from that in-'troduction it appears, Luke was not from the beginning a 'disciple, but only afterwards. For others were disciples 'from the beginning, as Peter, and the sons of Zebedee, 'who delivered to him the things which they had seen or 'heard.' Upon which some remarks were made by us in the place referred to. In his comment upon the history of the two disciples, whom Jesus met in the way to Emmaus, one of whom is said to be Cleopas, Luke xxiv. 18, Theophylact says: 'Some[r] have thought the other to be Luke 'the evangelist, who out of modesty declined to mention 'himself.' In his preface to the Acts, Theophylact says: 'The[s] writer is Luke, native of Antioch, by profession a 'physician.'

Euthymius says: 'Luke[t] was a native of Antioch, and a 'physician. He was a hearer of Christ, and, as some say, 'one of his seventy disciples, as well as Mark. He was 'afterwards very intimate with Paul. He wrote his gospel, 'with Paul's permission, fifteen years after our Lord's as-'cension.'

So Euthymius. But I should think, that very few, who supposed Luke to have been a native of Antioch, could likewise reckon him a hearer of Jesus Christ. But Euthymius, as it seems, puts together every thing he had heard or read, without judgment or discrimination.

What Nicephorus Callisti says, is, briefly, to this purpose. 'Two[u] only of the twelve, Matthew and John, left 'memoirs of our Lord's life on earth: and two of the 'seventy, Mark and Luke—Matthew wrote about fifteen 'years after our Saviour's ascension. Long after that, 'Mark and Luke published their gospels by the direction 'of Peter and Paul. The same Luke composed also the 'book of the Acts of the Apostles.'

To these authors I now add Eutychius, patriarch of

[p] Vol. v. p. 158. [q] P. 159. [r] P. 160.
[s] P. 161. [t] P. 165. [u] P. 167.

Alexandria, in the tenth century, who says, 'In [v] the time 'of the same emperor, (that is, Nero,) Luke wrote his gos- 'pel in Greek to a notable and wise man of the Romans, 'whose name was Theophilus: to whom also he wrote the 'Acts, or the history of the disciples. The evangelist Luke 'was a companion of the apostle Paul, going with him 'wherever he went. For which reason the apostle Paul in 'one of his epistles says; "Luke, the physician, salutes 'you."'

III. Having thus recited the testimonies of all these writers concerning the evangelist Luke, I shall now make some remarks.

1. We hence perceive, that the notion, that St. Luke was a painter, is without foundation, no notice having been taken of it in these ancient writers. Indeed this is said by one of our [w] authors, Nicephorus Callisti, in the fourteenth century, from whom a passage was quoted in the way of a summary conclusion. But we do not rely upon him for any thing not confirmed by other writers more ancient, and of better credit. Nor is this account received by [x] Tillemont, or [y] Du Pin, but rejected by them, as altogether fabulous, especially the latter; though our Dr. Cave [z] was somewhat inclined to admit one testimony to this affair, whilst he rejected the rest. For a farther account of St. Luke's pretended pictures of the Virgin Mary I refer to [a] Mr. Bower.

2. We learn also, what judgment ought to be formed of the account given of St. Luke by [b] Hugo Grotius,

[v] Etiam tempore hujus Imperatoris scripsit Lucas evangelium suum Græce, ad virum nobilem ex sapientibus Romanis, cui nomen Theophilus, ad quem item scripsit Acta seu discipulorum historiam. Erat autem Lucas evangelista comes Pauli apostoli, quocumque per aliquod tempus mansit. Unde est, quod Paulus apostolus in quâdam epistolâ suâ dicit: Lucas medicus vos salutat. Eutych. Annal. p. 335, 336.

[w] —ακρως δε την ζωγραφην τεχνην εξεπισαμενος. Niceph. l. 2. cap. 43. T. I. p. 210. [x] Saint Luc. Mem. Ec. T. II.

[y] Nicéphore et les nouveaux Grecs le font peintre. Et il y a en différens endroits des images de la Vierge, qu'on donne pour l'ouvrage de S. Luc. Ce sont des fictions, qui n'ont ni vérité ni apparence. Du Pin, Diss. l. 2. ch. 2. sect. 5.

[z] Of more authority with me would be an ancient inscription, found in a vault near the church of S. Mary in via lata at Rome, supposed to be the place where S. Paul dwelt: wherein mention is made of a picture of the B. Virgin, una ex vii. a B. Lucâ depictis: one of the seven painted by St. Luke. Cave's Lives of the Apostles, in English, p. 222.

[a] See his Lives of the Popes, Vol. III. p. 205, 206.

[b] Nostro autem nomen quidem Romanum fuisse arbitror, sed aliquanto longius.—Quare et Lucas, si quid video, contractum est ex Romano nomine, quod suspicor fuisse Lucilium. Nam ea gens tum Romæ florebat—Erat

and [c] J. J. Wetstein: which is, that he was a Syrian and a slave, either at Rome, or in Greece: and that having obtained his freedom, he returned to his native place, Antioch; where he became a Jewish proselyte, and then a christian. Which those learned interpreters endeavour to make out in a somewhat different manner. But neither has alleged any ancient writer, saying, that the evangelist Luke was once a slave, and afterwards became a free-man. Some slaves indeed were skilful in the art of medicine, and practised it in the families of their Roman masters. But does it follow, that because Luke was a physician, that he was also a slave? This therefore being entirely destitute of foundation in antiquity, must be esteemed the fiction of some learned critic, who was much delighted with his own ingenious speculations.

3. The account given of this evangelist by Eusebius, and Jerom after him, that he was a Syrian, and native of Antioch, may be justly suspected. We do not find it in Irenæus, nor Clement of Alexandria, nor Tertullian, nor Origen, nor in any other writer before Eusebius. Probably, therefore, it is not founded in any general or well attested tradition; but was the invention of some conjectural critic, who, having first imagined out of his own head, that Luke was originally a Gentile, at length determined that he was converted by Paul at Antioch. But all this was taken up without any good ground, or sufficient authority: and Luke may have been a believer, before either Paul or Barnabas went to Antioch. The same account is in Jerom: but he only follows Eusebius. He does not seem to have had any information about it from any others: which is an argument, that there was not an early tradition to this purpose.

noster hic Syrus, ut veteres consentiunt, et medicinam fecit.—Syria autem multos Romanis servos exhibebat. Et medicina, ut ex Plinio atque aliis discimus, munus erat servile. Manumissi autem nomen patroni induebant, ut comœdiarum scriptor, Afer cum esset, dictus est a patrono Terentio Terentius —Ita hic a Lucillio Lucillius, et contracte Λβκας. Credibile est, cum Romæ medicinam factitâsset aliquamdiu, acceptâ libertate, rediisse in patriam, &c. Grot. Pr. in S. Lucam.

[c] Exercuisse medicinam Paulus ad Colossenses testatur. Eusebius autem et Hieronymus addunt fuisse natione Syrum Antiochenum.—Interpretes porro conjecturâ probabili, tum ex nomine, tum ex arte quam profitebatur, colligunt, fuisse servum manumissum. Observant enim primo, nomen ejus in compendium fuisse redactum, ut pro Lucillio vel Lucano vocaretur Lucas.—Observant secundo, servos et præcipue Syros medicinam factitâsse.—Quod vero quidam existimant, eum Romæ servisse, et a domino, qui ipsum manumiserit, nomine Lucam appellatum fuisse, non satis certum videtur. Nam, præter familiam Lucilliam, quæ Romana fuit, etiam Græcis illud nomen fuit impositum, ut ex Anthologiâ constat. Wetst. Pr. ad Luc. T. I. p. 643.

This story, I say, is in Eusebius, and Jerom, and some others after them, but not in all succeeding writers. Some of the ancients, as Epiphanius, and others, supposed Luke to have been one of Christ's seventy disciples: which is inconsistent with his being a native of Antioch. If any did not see this inconsistency, and allowed both, it must have been owing to want of due attention and consideration. And the supposition made by some, that Luke was one of the seventy, shows, that there was no prevailing and well attested tradition, that he was a native of Antioch. For if there had been any such tradition, it is not easy to conceive, how any should have held the opinion, that he was one of the seventy.

It was formerly observed, that [d] Chrysostom no where says in his remaining works that Luke was of Antioch. Indeed, we [e] have lost one of his homilies upon the title and beginning of the Acts of the Apostles. Nevertheless, it seems, that in some of his many homilies, still remaining upon that book, or elsewhere, we should have seen this particular, if it had been known to him. He takes notice that [f] there might be seen in his time the house, in which Paul dwelled at Antioch. And he often speaks of the prerogatives of that city, in his homilies preached there. Methinks this also should have been mentioned as one: that Luke, whom (as is well known) he often celebrates, was a native of that city. If this had been then known, or generally believed, it is reasonable to expect, that it should have been frequently mentioned by Chrysostom, a native and presbyter of Antioch, who shined there as a preacher twelve years. This has disposed me to think, that in his time there was not at Antioch any prevailing tradition to this purpose.

Cave says, it [g] is likely, that Luke was converted by Paul at Antioch. Mill [h] says the same, rather more positively: which may now be the opinion of many. I have guessed, that it might be the opinion of the person who first gave rise to the account, that Luke was a Syrian, of Antioch, mentioned in Eusebius. But I do not remember that this is expressly said by any of the ancient writers, out of whom I have made so large collections in the preceding

[d] Vol. v. ch. cxviii. num. vi. 11. [e] Ib. vi. 2. [f] Ib. xvii. 15.

[g] —a D. Paulo, dum Antiochiæ ageret, (uti verisimile est,) conversus. Hist. Lit. T. I. p. 25.

[h] Scriptor operi huic suscipiendo, si quis unquam, summe idoneus; utpote qui ab ipso tempore conversionis, quæ contigit circa annum æræ vulgaris XLI. Ipsum enim Ἑλληνιστὰς istis, qui magno numero Antiochiæ conversi sunt, [Act. xi. 20.] omnino adnumerârim. Prol. n. 112.

volumes; and the thing is altogether unlikely. If Luke had been a Gentile, converted by Paul, he would have been always uncircumcised, and unfit to accompany Paul as he did. For the apostle would not have allowed the Greeks, or Gentiles of Antioch, or any other place, to receive that rite. Nor are there in the Acts, or Paul's epistles, any hints that Luke was his convert. Whereas, if he had been so, there[i] would have appeared some tokens of it in the affectionate expressions of Paul toward him on the one hand, or in the respectful and grateful expressions of Luke toward Paul on the other hand.

4. It has been reckoned doubtful by divers learned men, whether the evangelist Luke was a physician.

This particular is different from the foregoing. Nor has it any connection with it. Luke may have been of Antioch, and not a physician. He may have been a physician, and not of Antioch. The question is, whether Luke, the beloved physician mentioned by St. Paul, Col. iv. 14, be the evangelist. Divers of the ancients, as we have seen, have supposed him there intended. Chrysostom's expressions are these: 'This[k] is the evangelist: but he does not diminish him by naming him so late; he extols him, as he does Epaphras. It is likely, that there were others called by that name.' This last particular, perhaps, may deserve to be taken notice of. He affirms, that this is the evangelist; but he supposeth, that there were others of the same name.

That distinguishing character, beloved physician, not given to the apostle's companion and fellow-labourer, in any other epistle, has induced divers learned and inquisitive moderns to doubt, whether one and the same person is intended. Among these are[l] Calvin, [m] Sam. Basnage,

[i] This thought occurred to Dr. Whitby, who, in his preface to St. Luke's gospel, speaks to this purpose: 'We are told that Luke was converted by Paul at Thebes. Answer. But this we have only from Nicephorus. And it is the less credible, not only because it comes to us so late, but also because it appears not from any credible author, that St. Paul ever was there. It is more probable, from the silence of St. Luke, and St. Paul, who never calleth him his son, that he was a christian, or a believer, long before,'

[k] Οὐτος εστιν ο ευαγγελιστης—εικος ειναι και αλλως καλεμενως τω ονοματι τουτω. Chry. in Col. iv. hom. 12. T. XI. p. 412.

[l] Non assentior iis qui Lucam evangelistam intelligunt. Nam et notiorem fuisse judico, quam ut opus fuerit tali indicatione, et splendidiore elogio fuisset insignitus. Certe coadjutorem suum, aut fidum saltem comitem, et certaminum participem, vocâsset. Potius conjicio, hunc abfuisse, et alterum medici epitheto ab illo discerni. Quamquam non contendo, ut de re certâ, sed tamen conjecturas affero. Calvin. in Col. iv. 14.

[m] Sunt tamen in scripturâ Lucam evangelistam a Lucâ medico distinguendi causæ, &c. Basnag. ann. 60. n. xxxiii.

[n] Dr. Heumann, whose observations and arguments I transcribe below. On the other hand [o] Estius and [p] Mr. Jones strongly argue, that the same Luke is here intended, who is mentioned by St. Paul in some other epistles, even our evangelist.

Upon the whole, it must be acknowledged, that this distinguishing character, 'beloved physician,' has occasioned a difficulty. Nevertheless, I would hope, that it is not insuperable. It is allowed, that in all other places of St. Paul's epistles, by Luke is intended the evangelist. We know from the book of the Acts, that Luke, the writer of it, went with Paul to Rome, and stayed with him to the end of his captivity there; nor is there any reason to surmise, that at the time of writing this epistle he might be absent from the apostle upon some special occasion: for he joins in the salutations in the epistle to Philemon of Colosse, sent at the same time with this epistle to the Colossians, where also he is styled a 'fellow-labourer.' Philem. ver. 24. So that I cannot but think it probable, that Luke the evangelist was by profession a physician.

5. St. Luke was a Jew by birth, at least by religion.

None of the writers out of whom we have made collections, call him a Gentile. Some, in Jerom's time, whose names we do not know, said, Luke had been a Jewish proselyte, that is, had been converted from gentilism to judaism, and afterwards became a christian: but none, that I remember, expressly say that he was converted from gentilism to christianity; unless we should make an exception for Nicephorus Callisti, who in one place says so. But he is too late, and of too little credit, to be much regarded:

[n] Lucam evangelistam fuisse medicum, Hieronymus aliique probari posse credunt ex Col. iv. 14. Sed ex hoc ipso loco confirmari posse puto contrarium. Si enim isto loco Paulus innuisset comitem suum omnibus notum, Lucam evangelistam, simpliciter vocâsset Lucam, uti fecit, 2 Tim. iv. 11. At, ut significaret se de alio Lucâ loqui, discriminis causâ addit ὁ ἰατρος. C. A. Heuman. Ep. Misc. T. II. p. 518.

[o] Sunt qui in dubium revocent, num de Lucâ evangelistâ loquatur apostolus. Hunc enim dicunt notiorem fuisse, quam ut artis nomine eum designaret. Ac saltem, inquiunt, eum coadjutorem suum, aut fidelem comitem, vocâsset. Verum, ut vetus et communis, ita probatissima sententia est,—Lucam evangelistam medicum fuisse, et eum ipsum, cujus hic mentio est; (neque enim alium Lucam Paulo familiarem ulla prodit historia.) Quod vero tacuit hoc loco adjutorem, id diserte expressit ad Philemonem scribens, 'Demas et Lucas, adjutores mei.' Non enim putavit apostolus rem satis notam ubique inculcandam esse. Ubi illud observandum est, apostolum assidue Lucam cum Demâ nominare, tam hoc loco, et ad Philemonem, quam etiam in secundâ ad Tim. ep. cap. iv. Quis ergo dixerit, alium atque alium esse Lucam cum eodem Demâ nominatum? Com. in Col. iv. 14.

[p] See Mr. Jones's New and Full Method, Vol. III. p. 103, 104.

especially if he be singular. All our writers who speak of Luke as a companion and disciple of apostles, must have supposed him to be a Jew: and some have said that he was one of the seventy, as we have seen.

That Luke was a Jew by birth, or at least by religion, may be argued from his being a constant companion of Paul in many places, particularly at Jerusalem. If Luke had been an uncircumcised Gentile, some exceptions would have been made to him. Nevertheless nothing of that kind appears either in St. Paul's epistles or in the Acts. Another thing leading to this supposition is his[q] following the Jewish computations of times: such as the passover, pentecost, the fast. Of all which instances may be seen in Acts xii. 3; xx. 6 and 16; xxvii. 9.

Here it will be objected, that "Luke the physician," mentioned, Col. iv. 14, must have been a Gentile, because at ver. 10, 11, the apostle had mentioned "all those of the circumcision, who were his fellow-workers, and had been a comfort to him." To which I answer: It is not certain, that Luke, the evangelist, is the "beloved physician" there spoken of: we just now saw the reasons of doubting about it. But there is another solution. St. Paul[r] needs not to be understood to speak absolutely: there might be several exceptions to that proposition. Timothy was one, who joins with the apostle in sending the epistle: but he and Luke were so well known to all, as faithful to the apostle, that they needed not to be there mentioned. And Luke and Demas follow afterwards, somewhat lower, nearer the end of the epistle, very properly, ver. 14, "Luke the beloved physician, and Demas greet you." And I should be unwilling from this text, and the coherence, to conclude, that Demas was a Gentile. Says the apostle: Philem. ver. 24, "There salute thee Marcus, Aristarchus, Demas, Lucas, my fellow-labourers." The two first named were certainly Jews: I suppose, the other two were so likewise. Salutations from believers, of the Jewish people, would be very acceptable and encouraging to Gentile converts.

St. Luke says, Acts i. 19, "insomuch as that field was called in their proper tongue Aceldama:" whence some may argue, that he was not a Jew. But it might be observed,

[q] Quis vero cum veri specie aliquâ Lucam evangelistam unum ex Judæis fuisse neget? Lucam, qui in designandis temporibus Judæorum disciplinam adhibet, Pentecostem scilicet, jejunium, tertiam noctis vigiliam; quæ omnia ex judaïco more petuntur. Basnag. an. 60. n. xxxiii.

[r] Adde, quod iste sermo, 'hi soli,' non est ita rigide accipiendus, ut absolute excludat omnes alios, sed benigno sensu: hi fere soli sunt adjutores. Est. ad iv. Col. 11.

that none of the evangelists, when they speak of the Jews, say any thing to denote they were of that people. Says St. Matthew, ch. xxviii. 15, "And this saying is commonly reported among the Jews until this day." Mark vii. 3, "For the pharisees, and all the Jews, except they wash their hands, eat not." John i. 19, "The Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem." Ch. v. 1, "After this there was a feast of the Jews." See also ch. xix. 40—42. And does not St. Paul say, 1 Thess. ii. 14, 15, "Ye became followers of the churches of God in Judea. For ye also have suffered like things of your own countrymen, even as they of the Jews: who both killed the Lord Jesus, and their own prophets." It might be not amiss to observe also Acts xxviii. 17—19. And I might refer to other places.

That this evangelist was a Jew, is the opinion of many learned and judicious moderns; particularly Mr. S. Basnage, whom I have cited at note [q] p. 363, and J. A. Fabricius, who[s] likewise is clearly of the same opinion. Indeed I think it ought not to be questioned.

6. Luke the evangelist was probably an early Jewish believer, soon after Christ's ascension, if not a hearer of Christ, and one of the seventy disciples.

Our most ancient writers, as we have seen, speak of Luke as a disciple of the apostles. Some have reckoned him one of the seventy, others have thought him to be Lucius, mentioned by St. Paul in the epistle to the Romans, and others have supposed that he was one of the two disciples that met Jesus in the way to Emmaus.

The large accounts which Luke has given in the book of the Acts of several below the rank of apostles, has made me think, that he was one of the same rank, and possibly one of them. There are three instances of this kind. The first is Stephen, one of the seven deacons, who, as we learn, "was full of faith and power, and did great wonders and miracles among the people:" against whom there arose a strong opposition, so that he was the very first martyr for Christ and his doctrine, and of whom St. Luke has recorded a long discourse before the Jewish council, ch. vii. The second is Philip, another of the seven, of whom St. Luke writes, that he first preached Christ to the Samaritans,

[s] Lucas, sive Lucius,—incertum, num idem cum Lucâ medico, Col. iv. 14, quin Judæus fuerit, at antequam Christo nomen daret, ne dubito quidem, præcipue si verum est quod legas in Origenis sive Adamantii cujusdam dialogis, adversus Marcionitas, et Epiphanii Ll. II. eum fuisse e numero LXX. discipulorum. Bib. Gr. l. 4. c. v. T. III. p. 132.

ch. viii. 5—8; "so that the people with one accord gave heed to those things which Philip spake, hearing and seeing the miracles which he did;" and what follows. The same Philip afterwards, having first explained the scriptures to him, and brought him to sincere faith in Jesus as the Christ, baptized the chamberlain and treasurer of the queen of Ethiopia, a Jewish proselyte, and a man of great distinction, ver. 26—40. The third instance of this kind is that of the men of Cyprus and Cyrene, "who travelled as far as Phenice, Cyprus, and Antioch, preaching the word to Jews only." Who soon after their coming to "Antioch, spake unto the Greeks, preaching the Lord Jesus. And the hand of the Lord was with them; and a great number believed, and turned unto the Lord," ch. xi. 19—21. These were the men who first preached to Gentiles out of Judea: as Peter was the first who preached to Gentiles at the house of Cornelius in Cæsarea, ch. x. and not long before them. We have, as it seems, the names of three of those men. Ch. xiii. 1, "Simeon, called Niger, Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen." The second person here named may be our evangelist.

A like argument may be formed in favour of St. Luke's having been one of Christ's seventy disciples, in that he, and he only of all the evangelists, has inserted in his gospel an account of the commission which Christ gave unto them, ch. x. 1—20. And indeed some learned men of later times, as well as formerly, have been of opinion that Luke was one of the seventy. Among these is our Dr. Whitby, who[t] reckoned both Mark and Luke to have been of that number. J. A. Fabricius[u] was inclined to be of the same opinion. And in favour of it refers to the passages of Adamantius and Epiphanius, before taken notice of by us. This likewise was the sentiment of[v] Mr. Basnage.

Dr. C. A. Heumann has lately published a dissertation concerning Christ's seventy disciples, containing many curious observations: and he supposeth that[w] these several following were of that number. Matthias, chosen in the

[t] See his Preface to St. Luke's gospel.

[u] —præcipue, si verum est, quod legas in Origenis seu Adamantii cujusdam Dialogis adversus Marcionitas, et Epiphanii H. LI. n. xi. Neque adeo repugnat et Lucam et Marcum ex illis fuisse, licet veteres miro consensu, ut Marcum Petri, ita Lucam tradunt Pauli fuisse interpretem et sectatorem. Haud dubie enim apostolorum etiam præ LXX. illis magna prærogativa erat, &c. Bib. Gr. l. iv. cap. v. T. III. p. 133.

[v] Ann. 60. num. xxviii.

[w] Dissertatio de Septuaginta Christi Legatis. ap. Nov. Syllog. Dissertat. part I. p. 120—154.

room of the traitor, Joseph, called Barsabas, surnamed Justus, and probably the seven deacons, or however some of them, and the four teachers and prophets of Antioch, Barnabas, Simeon called Niger, Lucius of Cyrene, whom he thinks to be our Luke the evangelist, and Manaen. Acts xiii. 1. His argument is to this purpose. We have not in the gospels the names of those disciples; nor did Christ form a college or company of them, as he did of the twelve, because it was a temporary office, which subsisted for a short time only. They were but once sent forth; and when they were returned, their commission was at an end. Nevertheless they hereby became qualified for public service: and it may be reckoned very probable, that if an opportunity was afforded, they would be very willing, after Christ's ascension, to exert themselves in his cause. And it is very likely that some of these seventy were chosen, and employed by the apostles as men who had been already exercised in the service of the gospel, and were thereby fitted for farther usefulness.

So that learned writer. And it must be acknowledged, that this is a specious argument: but it is rather founded in an ingenious speculation, than in the authority of testimony; which, in this case, would be more valuable.

Indeed Epiphanius, beside the places[x] formerly alleged, where he says, Mark and Luke were of the seventy, has another, where[y] he mentions a great many who were said to be of that number: as the seven deacons, all whom he mentions by name, and also Matthias, Mark, Luke, Justus, Barnabas, Apelles, Rufus, Niger. And therefore, we cannot deny, that in the time of Epiphanius, there were some, who entertained an opinion, that all these were of Christ's seventy disciples. Nevertheless, we do not find it in Irenæus, or Clement of Alexandria, or Origen, or any others of the highest antiquity, and best credit: nor in Eusebius, or Jerom, that I remember, who were acquainted with the writings of those ancient authors, and many others, which are not come to us. Eusebius has a chapter concerning the disciples of our Saviour: he says, the names of Christ's twelve apostles were well known; but[z] there was no where any catalogue of the seventy. However, he mentions Barnabas, Matthias, and the disciple put up with him, and one or two more, who were said to be of the seventy: but he takes not here any notice of Mark, or Luke, or of any of the seven deacons.

[x] Hær. LI. num. vi. xi. [y] II. 20. num. iv. [z] *Των δε ἑβδομηκοντα μαθητων καταλογος μεν ουδεις ουδαμη φερεται.* H. E. l. i. c. 12.

Matthias and Barsabas certainly were such men as are described, Acts i. 21, 22, and they may have been of the seventy: but we cannot be certain, because we have not been assured of it by any accounts that demand full assent. Some of the seven deacons may have been of the seventy, as Stephen and Philip; but we do not know that they were. It is very probable, that all those deacons were not of the seventy, particularly Nicolas, a proselyte of Antioch. If Luke, the evangelist, be the same as Lucius of Cyrene, there ariseth a strong objection against his having been one of the seventy. Simeon, called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, mentioned, Acts xiii. 1, and "the men of Cyprus and Cyrene," (of whom those two just mentioned were a part,) were early believers, after Christ's ascension, and they may have heard and seen the Lord in person: but they cannot be well supposed to have been of the seventy. Christ's twelve apostles were of Galilee: it is likely, that the seventy also were of the same country, or near it. Christ sent them forth from him, to go over the land of Israel, and to return to him in a short time, where he should be: and his usual residence was in Galilee. It does not appear to me at all probable, that our Lord put into that commission any men, who were born and usually resided abroad, in other countries, out of the land of Israel.

Hitherto, then, we have not any full proof, that our evangelist was one of the seventy. Let us proceed.

St. Luke, ch. xxiv. 13—34, relates how two disciples met Jesus after his resurrection, as they were going to Emmaus. And he says, that the name of one of them was Cleopas. Theophylact, in his comment upon this place, as [a] formerly shown, observes: 'Some[b] say, that one of these two was Luke himself: but that the evangelist concealed his own name.' Nicephorus Callisti[c] in one place, makes no doubt, that Luke was the other disciple not named. It is likely, that he had met with it in more ancient writers. Sam. Basnage[d] readily declares himself of the same opinion.

[a] This Vol. p. 160.

[b] *Τινες τον ἑνα τωτων των δυο αυτον τον Λεκαν ειναι φασι· διο και απεκρυψε το ἑαυτε ονομα ὁ ευαγγελιστης.* Theoph. in Luc. cap. xxiv. p. 539.

[c] *Τοις περι Λεκαν και Κλεοπαν την ὁδον παριεσι γνωριζεται, προς ἑσπεραν εις δειπνον αυτοις συγκατακλιθεις.* Niceph. l. i. c. 34. p. 117.

[d] Nulla sane magis idonea ratio observatur animo, cur Cleopæ, non alterius, Lucas meminerit; quomodo Joannes, ubi de se mentionem agitat, nomen dissimulat suum. Si de grege apostolorum fuissent, aut virorum multâ laude in evangelio celebratorum, uti Nathanaël, quod Epiphanio visum, iterum atque iterum dicemus, tam ejus quam Cleopæ nomen fœnerâsset. Ann. 33. num. CL.

Indeed, I think, it has a great appearance of probability. It is much more likely, than the tradition, or interpretation in Epiphanius, that [e] it was Nathanael. The same Basnage says, that if Nathanael had been the other, St. Luke would have named him.

St. Mark, ch. xvi. 12, 13, has a like account, but briefer, of two, to whom Christ appeared as "they were walking into the country." He does not name either of them. Grotius [f] allows that Mark's and Luke's histories are of the same persons. Both the evangelists speak of these as two of them. They were not of the twelve, but yet they were of their company, such as had been with Jesus: as is allowed by [g] Grotius, and [h] Beza. Nevertheless they say that [i] Luke is not the other. He is excluded, as they say, by the tenor of his introductions both to his gospel, and the Acts. Their reasonings will be considered presently.

However, supposing Luke to be the person here intended, I do not think that he is thereby shown to be one of the seventy. Cleopas, and the other, were disciples of Christ and eye-witnesses: but it does not therefore follow that they were of the number of the seventy.

We proceed. Among the salutations in the epistle to the Romans are these, ch. xvi. 20. "Timothy my work-fellow, and Lucius, and Jason, and Sosipater my kinsmen, salute you." All these were Jewish believers, and the three last mentioned, as it seems, were the apostle's relations. That by Lucius some supposed the evangelist Luke to be intended, we have been informed by so ancient a writer as Origen. And it is very likely that St. Luke's name was written differently: Lucas, Lucius, and Lucanus. There is the more reason to think that the evangelist is here in-

[e] See Vol. iv. p. 193.

[f] Quare immerito Euthymius hic aliam putat historiam indicari, quam eam, quæ a Lucâ copiose describitur. Grot. ad Marc. xvi. 12.

[g] —*δυσιν εκ αυτων.*] *των μετα Ιησε γενομενων*, ut supra dixit, ver. 10. Nam hoc nomine etiam alii extra xii. censentur, præcipue qui de numero erant illorum septuaginta. Grot. ad Marc. xvi. 11.

[h] Ex iis, *εξ αυτων*, nempe discipulis, non autem ex apostolis. Aliorum enim præter apostolos mentio facta fuit præcedente versu 9. Bez. in Luc. xxiv. 13.

[i] Alterum fuisse hunc nostrum Lucam, quidam ex veteribus arbitrantur, quorum opinio refellitur ex præfatione Actis Apostolorum præpositâ. Bez. ad Luc. xxiv. 18.

Duo ex illis, nempe eorum, quos modo *λοιπων* 'cæterorum,' nomine designâras, e sectatoribus Christi. Probabiliter sentiunt veteres, fuisse hos de numero LXX.—Nomen alterius infra exprimit Lucas, Cleopam vocans. Alterum ipsum Lucam multi putârunt; quos satis ipse refellit in evangelii anteloquio, ab oculatis testibus se separans. Grot. ad Luc. xxiv. 13.

tended, because he must have been with the apostle at the time of writing the epistle to the Romans. Says Mr. Tillemont, 'Many[k] believe that St. Luke is he whom St. Paul 'in his epistle to the Romans calls Lucius, making his 'name a little more Latin. And it is the more likely, in-'asmuch as the Acts assure us, that St. Luke was then 'with St. Paul. If that be so, he was related to this apos-'tle.' Grotius, who supposed our evangelist to have been of Antioch, taking notice of the above-mentioned observation of Origen, says, that[l] Lucius in Rom. xvi. is the same as Lucius of Cyrene, mentioned Acts xiii. 1.

Fabricius[m] esteemed it somewhat probable that Lucius is the evangelist.

Dr. Heumann supposes[n] this Lucius to be St. Luke, and the same as Lucius of Cyrene, whom[o] he computes to be one of the seventy disciples, as before seen.

Mr. Basnage likewise argues very strongly, that[p] Lucius is our evangelist.

Indeed this opinion cannot be well said to be destitute of probability: since there is a good deal of reason to think that Luke was in the apostle's company when he wrote the

[k] Mem. Ec. tom. II. S. Luc.

[l] Docet nos Origenes, in annotationibus epistolæ ad Romanos, fuisse qui crederent Lucium eum, qui in eâdem epistolâ nominatur, xvi. 21, esse hunc ipsum Lucam, et Lucium dici flexione Romanâ, Lucam Græcâ. Ego Lucium illum, cujus ibi meminit Paulus, puto non alium esse a Cyrenensi, quem noster hic nominat, Actor. xiii. 1. Grot. Præf. ad Evang. S. Luc.

[m] Fuerunt enim jam olim, qui, teste Origene, Lucam eundem putârunt cum Lucio, quem Paulus inter *συγγενεις* suos refert, Rom. xvi. 21. Neque verisimilitudine destituitur hæc sententia. Fab. Bib. Gr. ubi supra, p. 132.

[n] Lucas non est verum, id est, pure expressum, nomen evangelistæ, sed vel Lucanus, (quem in modum et ex Silvanus factum est Silas,) vel Lucius. Ac perverisimile est, evangelistam nostrum esse Lucium illum Cyrenæum, cujus fit mentio, Act. xiii. 1. Quem nec diversum esse credo ab illo Lucio, quem Paulus, Rom. xvi. 21, vocat cognatum suum, simulque testatur, eum in suo comitatu fuisse. Heumann. Ep. Misc. T. II. p. 519.

[o] Jure igitur credimus, et hos quatuor [Act. xiii. 1.] fuisse e septuaginta illorum discipulorum numero. Jam inter hos si Lucius non est alius quam Lucas evangelista, merito et Lucam nostrum recensemus inter septuaginta illos discipulos. Diss. de LXX. Christi Legat. sect. 20. p. 149.

[p] Lucam evangelistam Paulo consanguineum fuisse verisimilitudinis multum habet. Lucium sane, cujus nomine Romanos salutat apostolus, ex ipsius cognatis unus erat. Sunt vero non pertenues conjecturæ, quibus adducamur ad existimandum unum eundemque virum cum Lucâ Lucium esse. Quæ antiqua sane sententia fuit, cujus meminit Origenes in Rom. xvi.—Silam quidem Paulus ipse Silvanum vocat. Aderat etiam Paulo comes Lucas, cum missa est ad Romanos epistola, quem insalutatos præteriisse, prorsus sit incredibile; quod tamen factum fuisset, si Lucius est a Lucâ diversus. Basn. ann. 60. n. xxxiii.

epistle to the Romans. And if Lucius be not he, no mention is made of him; which is very unlikely.

If this be our evangelist, we hence learn that he was a Jew, and related to the apostle. And if this be Lucius of Cyrene, we know his character, and, in part, his history, from Acts xi. 19—21. and xiii. 1—4. He was an early Jewish believer, after Christ's ascension, and together with others was very serviceable in early preaching the gospel to Jews and Gentiles out of Judea. And, once more, if the other, who accompanied Cleopas in the way to Emmaus, be Luke the evangelist, he was a disciple and eye-witness of Jesus Christ: but I do not say one of the seventy.

Now we come to consider the objection of Beza, Grotius, and divers others: who have supposed, that St. Luke, in the introduction to his gospel, excludes himself from the number of eye-witnesses. But though this has been a difficulty with many, there have been of late divers learned men, remarkable for inquisitiveness and good judgment, who are not much moved by it. One of them is Dr. Whitby in his preface to St. Luke's gospel, already taken notice of by us. Another is [q] Fabricius, a third [r] Basnage, the fourth Heumann: who in his fore-cited Dissertation observes, that [s] St. Luke's introduction imports no more, than that he was not an eye-witness from the beginning, nor an apostle. But he may have been for some while a follower of Christ, very consistently with what he there writes: and, probably, he was so. But he very fitly puts the credit and authority of his history upon the testimony of the apostles.

I shall likewise transcribe below a passage of Petavius [t]

[q] Neque obstat porro, quod Lucas affirmat, se ea scribere, quæ acceperit ab illis, qui fuissent απ' αρχης αυτοπται. Nam non de omnibus LXX. dici hoc poterat, quod Act. i. 21. et seq. ad apostolum requiritur. Bib. Gr. T. III. p. 133.

[r] Ann. 60. num. xxviii.

[s] Repugnare quidem videri possit ipse Lucas, cap. i. 2, scribens, se quæ tradat accepisse a τοις απ' αρχης αυτοπταις. Verum non se negat fuisse αυτοπτην qui negat se αυτοπτην απ' αρχης fuisse. Concedimus itaque non ab initio statim, uti apostolos, quos ὑπηρετας τϐ λογϐ appellat, interfuisse rebus a Christo gestis Lucam. Sed aliquo jam tempore functo suo munere Messiæ se applicuisse Lucam, et postea semper in ejus comitatu fuisse, quo minus credamus, hoc ipsius testimonium minime impedit. Accedit, quod modestiæ erat apostolorum potius, quam suum ipsius testimonium commendare, jubereque lectores, si forte sibi crediturі sint ægrius, fidem habere apostolis, testibus nulli obnoxiis exceptioni. Heum. Diss. ib. num. xx.

[t] Quod Lucas e discipulorum numero fuerit, asserit et Dorotheus in Synopsi—Sed contra sentiunt plerique, et id ex ipsis Lucæ verbis colligunt, cum ait: Εδοξε κἀμοι.—Sed tantum abest, ut hæc discipulum Christi fuisse, ac non pleraque, cum ab eo gererentur, oculis usurpâsse negent, ut contrarium potius hinc educi possit. Verbum enim παρακολϐθειν nonnunquam ad eam notitiam refertur, quæ oculis ipsis, ac propriâ intelligentiâ comparatur, non

from his animadversions upon Epiphanius, though it be somewhat long. I do it the rather, because he is an older author than any of those hitherto cited in behalf of this interpretation. He is considering what Epiphanius says of Luke's being one of Christ's seventy disciples. The sum of what he advanceth is to this purpose: 'He dares not affirm, 'that Luke was a disciple of Christ, because many of the 'fathers have thought otherwise. But he says, there is 'nothing in St. Luke's introduction to induce us to think, 'he was not a disciple of Christ, or that he had not seen a 'large part of the things related by him: but rather the 'contrary. And he was willing to show, that Epiphanius is 'not contradicted by St. Luke himself.'

7. St. Luke was for a good while a constant companion of St. Paul. But he was also acquainted with other apostles.

Tertullian and Chrysostom, as we have seen, call St. Paul Luke's master. But they need not be understood to intend that Luke learned nothing from other apostles. So Irenæus said: 'Luke, the companion of Paul, put down 'in a book the gospel that had been preached by Paul.' But in another place he says, 'That [u] Luke was a fellow-'labourer of the apostles, especially of Paul.' And in another place he calls Luke [v] 'a follower and disciple of the 'apostles.' And Eusebius said: 'Luke was for the most 'part a companion of Paul, but had also more than a slight 'acquaintance with the other apostles.' And Jerom says: 'It was supposed, that Luke did not learn his gospel from 'the apostle Paul only, who had not conversed with the 'Lord in the flesh, but also from other apostles. Which 'also he acknowledgeth at the beginning of his volume,

aliorum sermonibus; ut, cum Demosthenes *εν τῳ περι παραπρεσβειας*, de Æschine, cujus in legatione comes fuerat, sic loquitur: *Και ὁ τατα πονηρευματα ειδως, και παρηκολαθηκως ἁπασι κατηγορω.* Sic igitur Lucas, *ανωθεν παρηκολαθηκεναι πασιν ακριβως* dicitur, hoc est, comperta, exploratæque, ac spectata etiam, habuisse. Ac videri potest et nonnulla hic antithesis esse, ut cum superiore versu dixerit: Quemadmodum multi res a Christo gestas scribere aggressi sunt, *καθως παρεδοσαν ἡμιν οἱ απ' αρχης*, statim subjiciat: *Εδοξε κἀμοι παρηκολαθηκοτι*, hoc est, qui non, ut illi, *εκ παραδοσεως*, sed ex propriâ id scientiâ compererim. Cæterum, tametsi ad eum sensum accommodari Lucæ verba nihil prohibet, non idcirco tamen Christi discipulum fuisse certo pronuntiare ausim, cum huic adversari sententiæ longe plures Patres intelligam. Sed ista commemoravi, ut ne Lucæ ipsi de se testanti refragari quisquam Epiphanium arbitretur. Petav. Animadv. in Epiphan. Hær. li. num. xi. p. 89, 90.

[u] Quoniam non solum prosequutor, sed et cooperarius fuerit apostolorum, maxime autem Pauli. Iren. l. 3. c. 14. n. 1. p. 201. b.

[v] Lucas autem sectator et discipulus apostolorum. Ibid. cap. x. [al. xi.] in p. 189.

'saying, "Even as they delivered them unto us, who from 'the beginning were eye-witnesses of the word."'

That must be right, I think, because it is agreeable to the writer's own words in the introduction to his work. I always consider Paul as an eye-witness: but he was not an eye-witness from the beginning, nor a minister of the word from the beginning. He must have had a distinct knowledge of all things concerning the Lord Jesus. Christianity, as has been often and justly said, is founded in facts. In order to preach it, Paul must have had a knowledge of Christ's life, preaching, miracles, death, resurrection, and ascension. As he was not instructed by other apostles in the doctrine preached by him, he must have had it from revelation. And I suppose that a man who, like Luke, often heard Paul preach, might have composed a gospel or history of Jesus Christ from Paul's sermons, preached in divers places, and to men of all characters: and the ancients seem to have supposed that Luke had thereby great assistances for composing his gospel; which I do not deny. Nevertheless it seems fairly to be concluded from his own introduction, that he had consulted others also.

It might not be amiss, if I had room for such observations, to compare St. Luke's gospel and the historical parts of St. Paul's epistles, and also of his discourses recorded by Luke himself in the book of the Acts. It is reasonable to think, that wherever any disciples of Jesus preached the christian religion, they gave an account of the things concerning Christ. Wherever the apostles, or others, preached, in order to induce faith in Jesus and his doctrine, their first discourses must have been historical. The reason of the thing leads us to this; and we are assured of it from their discourses, of which we have an account. We perceive this in the discourses of St. Peter at Jerusalem. Acts ii. 22—36; ch. iii. 12—16; ch. iv. 10; and at the house of Cornelius in Cæsarea, ch. x. 34—43; from Paul's discourses in the synagogue at Antioch in Pisidia; ch. xiii. 23—38; at Athens, ch. xvii. 31; at Corinth, ch. xix. 8; before the governor Festus, and king Agrippa, ch. xxvi; and at Rome: though then many years had passed, since the ascension of Christ, and since his religion had begun to be preached, and propagated in the world. St. Luke's general account of Paul there is thus: "And Paul dwelt two whole years in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ," ch. xxviii. 30, 31. 'That is,' says

[w] Grotius, 'his miracles, doctrine, death, resurrection, and 'the mission of the Spirit: by which things men were as-'sured, that the heavenly kingdom was set up.' And this may have been the occasion of the frequent use of those expressions, "preaching Christ, and preaching Jesus Christ," as equivalent to preaching the christian religion, or the doctrine of the gospel.

I must own, that in the survey of St. Luke's gospel, and St. Paul's discourses and epistles, I have not discerned any such special agreement, as to be induced to think that one of them had copied the other.

St. Paul says, at Antioch in Pisidia, Acts xiii. 23, "Of this man's seed has God raised unto Israel a Saviour, Jesus." And 2 Tim. ii. 8, "Remember, that Jesus Christ, of the seed of David, was raised from the dead, according to my gospel." These things are agreeable to St. Luke's gospel: but they are also in St. Matthew's; and must have been taught by all the apostles, and all preachers of the gospel.

Acts xx. 35, "And to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said, It is more blessed to give than to receive." That saying of our Lord is not recorded by St. Luke in his gospel, nor by any other of the evangelists.

1 Cor. xv. 5—7, And that he was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve: after that he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once—After that he was seen of James, then of all the apostles." St. Luke's account of our Saviour's appearances after his resurrection are in ch. xxiv. and Acts i. 1—12. And if they are observed, I suppose that no remarkable agreement between Paul and Luke will be discerned, but rather the contrary. The five hundred brethren, mentioned by St. Paul, probably saw Jesus in Galilee: where, as in Matt. xxvi. 32, xxviii. 7, and Mark xvi. 7, he appointed to meet the disciples: but of this there is nothing in St. Luke. And all our Saviour's appearances to the disciples, mentioned by him, were at Jerusalem, or in its neighbourhood. Nor does Luke give any hint of that particular appearance to James mentioned by St. Paul: not now to add any thing farther.

However, I shall transcribe below [x] some observations of Mr. Wetstein, relating to this matter.

[w] Miracula ejus, et præcepta, et mortem, et resurrectionem, et missionem Spiritûs Sancti; per quæ certifiebant homines de regno illo cœlesti. Gr. ad Act. xxviii. 31.

[x] Si Lucas vel Pauli hortatu, vel peculiari Spiritûs Sancti afflatu, ad scribendum impulsus fuisset, rem memoratu tam dignam—silentio neutiquam

8. It may be reckoned probable, that St. Luke died a natural death: forasmuch as none of the most ancient writers, such as Clement of Alexandria, Irenæus, Origen, Eusebius, Jerom, say any thing of his martyrdom. Gregory Nazianzen, in [y] one of his orations, seems to put Luke among martyrs. Nevertheless, as is well observed by [z] Tillemont, Elias Cretensis, in the eighth century, famous for his commentaries upon Gregory, supposeth it certain, that [a] Luke did not die a martyr any more than John, the apostle and evangelist: but that after having suffered much in the cause of Christ and the gospel, he returned in peace to the God of peace. Gaudentius, bishop of Brescia, about 387, observes, that [b] in his time it was generally said, that Luke and Andrew finished their course at Patræ in Achaia. He does not say, in the way of martyrdom. I do not perceive Paulinus, about the year 403, to [c] celebrate Luke, as a martyr, but rather Nazarius, mentioned in the next verse. If martyr belongs to Luke, it may be understood in a general sense, as equivalent to confessor, or a great sufferer for the gospel.

9. Cave says, that [d] Luke lived a single life, and died in the 84th year of his age, about the year of Christ 70, but of what death is uncertain. And it is true that Nicephorus, in the fourteenth century, says, that [e] Luke died in the 80th year of his age. And in some editions of Jerom's book of Illustrious Men there is a passage, near the end of the article of St. Luke, importing that he lived 84 years in celibacy. But Martianay, the learned Benedictine editor of Jerom's works, says, that [f] passage is not in any manu-

transiisset. Quod vero quidam existimant, ex locis 2 Tim. ii. 8, et 1 Cor. xv. 4, collatis cum Luc. xxiv. 7, 34, probari, Lucæ, quod dicitur, evangelium ad Paulum potius auctorem esse referendum, nobis parum sit verisimile. Wetsten. ad Luc. cap. i. ver. 3. tom. I. p. 644.

[y] Orat. 3. p. 76. [z] St. Luc. Mem. Ec. T. II.

[a] Quippe, ne longe abeam, Joannes—et item Lucas, haudquâquam interempti fuere; verum, cum permultas propter Christum et ejus evangelium calamitates pertulissent, in pace ad eum, qui pacis Deus est, reversi sunt. El. Cr. Annot. p. 322, 323.

[b] Andreas et Lucas apud Patras, Achaiæ civitatem, consummati referuntur. Gaud. Serm. 17. ap. Bib. PP. tom. V. p. 969. C.

[c] Hic pater Andreas, et magno nomine Lucas,
Martyr et illustris sanguine Nazarius.
Paulin. Ep. 32. p. 210. Conf. Annot. p. 75. Paris, 1685.

[d] Vitam egit cœlibem, ac mortuus est anno ætatis 84, circa annum (ut nonnulli volunt) 70. Quo vero mortis genere, incertum est. Hist. Lit. p. 25.

[e] Ογδοηκοντα ετων γενομενος, ὡς φασιν. Niceph. l. 2. c. 43.

[f] Falso additur in hoc loco: 'Vixit octoginta et quatuor annos, uxorem non habens.' Nullum exstat vestigium horum verborum in manuscriptis codicibus. Neque novi, unde putida hæc commenta fluxerint. Martian.

scripts: nor does he know whence that silly fiction was borrowed. Fabricius[g] confirms that account.

IV. There is no great difficulty in settling the time of St. Luke's writing his gospel. The Acts of the Apostles were published in 63, or 64, and not long after his gospel, as is generally allowed. Accordingly Dr. Mill[h] supposeth those books to have been two parts of one and the same volume, and to have been published in the year of Christ 64. This argument was represented at length[i] formerly. The reader is referred to it, that I may not enlarge upon it in this place.

V. However, I cannot forbear to observe some marks of time in the gospel itself.

1. The occasion of writing it, as St. Luke assures us in the introduction, was, that many had already published narrations of these things. But it cannot be reasonably thought that many should have written histories of Jesus Christ, presently after his ascension, nor indeed till many years after it.

2. There are several things in the gospel, from which it may be fairly argued, that it was not written till after Peter and Paul, and perhaps other apostles likewise, had preached to Gentiles, and received them into the church, without their embracing the peculiarities of the law of Moses.

3. In ch. ii. 10, the angel says to the shepherds near Bethlehem: "I bring you good tidings of great joy to all people." At ver. 30—32, Simeon says, at the presentation of Jesus in the temple: "Mine eyes have seen thy salvation, which thou hast prepared before the face of all people: a light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of thy people Israel." In ch. iii. 8, says John the baptist: "God is able of these stones to raise up children to Abraham." And I might here refer to ch. i. 78, 79. I suppose that when St. Luke recorded these things, he understood them; which he could not do, till after the gospel had been freely and fully published among Gentiles.

4. That St. Luke understood the spirituality of the doctrine of the gospel, may be concluded from the account which he has given of our Lord's discourse, recorded ch. vi. 20—49. I might for this refer to ch. i. 74, 75, and other places.

[g] Sed illa Erasmus, Martinus Lipsius, et Suffridus Petri, in exemplaribus suis mss. non invenerunt. Fabr. in loc. ap. Bib. Eccles.

[h] Voluminibus hujus D. Lucæ partem posteriorem, seu λογον δευτερον quod attinet, librum dico Actuum Apostolorum, haud dubium est, quin is scriptus fuerit statim post λογον πρωτον, sive evangelium. Proleg. num. 121.

[i] See in this volume, ch. iv. sect. iv. p. 291—295.

5. Ch. vii. 9, When our Lord had heard the centurion's profession of faith, "he marvelled at him, and said: I have not found so great faith, no not in Israel." In Matt. viii. 11, 12, is a farther enlargement. The like to which may be seen in Luke xiii. 28—30.

6. In ch. xiii. 6—9, is the parable of "the fig-tree, spared one year more:" representing the ruin of the Jewish church and people as near, if they did not speedily repent.

7. In ch. xi. 48—51, are predictions of the calamities coming upon the Jewish people. In ch. xiii. 34, 35, are our Lord's lamentations over the city of Jerusalem, in the view of the calamities coming upon it. See likewise ch. xvii. 22—37; ch. xix. 11—27; ch. xx. 9—18; ch. xxi. 5—11; and ver. 20—35. As St. Luke enlargeth so much in his accounts of these predictions, it may be argued, that the accomplishment was not far off when he wrote.

8. In ch. xiv. 16—24, is the parable of "a great supper;" when they who were first invited, refused to come: whereupon the invitations were enlarged, and made more general. And in the end he who made the supper declares, that "they who were first bidden, should not taste of it:" representing the call of the Gentiles, and the general rejection of the Jews for their unbelief.

9. In ch. xiii. 18—21, are the parables of the "grain of mustard-seed" and "leaven," representing the wonderful progress of the gospel; of which, probably, St. Luke had been witness, when he recorded them.

10. Ch. xxiv. 46, 47—"And he said unto them—that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." When St. Luke wrote this, it is very likely, that he well understood the commission of the apostles, as reaching to men of all denominations, throughout the whole world.

11. But I need not enlarge farther on these internal characters of time, the other argument being sufficient and satisfactory.

VI. I must say something concerning the place where St. Luke's gospel was written.

Jerom, as before[k] quoted, in the prologue to his commentary upon St. Matthew says, that[l] Luke, the third evangelist, published his gospel in the countries of Achaia and Bœötia. In his book of Illustrious Men he says, the[m] Acts were written at Rome. Gregory Nazianzen says,

[k] Vol. iv. ch. cxiv. num. vii. 1. volumen condidit. p. 34.

[l] In Achaiæ Bœotiæque partibus

[m] P. 39.

that [n] Luke wrote for the Greeks, or in Achaia. And speaking of the provinces of divers of the apostles and evangelists, he [o] assigns Judea to Peter, the Gentiles to Paul, Achaia to Luke, Epirus to Andrew, Ephesus or Asia to John, India to Thomas, Italy to Mark; in which country, undoubtedly, many of the ancients believed this last-mentioned evangelist to have written his gospel. Chrysostom does not say where Luke wrote: but only that [p] he wrote for all in general.

We are told [q] by Philostorgius, that in the reign of the emperor Constantius St. Luke's reliques were translated from Achaia to Constantinople. It must therefore have been the general persuasion in those times, that St. Luke had died, and had been buried in Achaia. Nicephorus says, that [r] when Paul left Rome, Luke returned to Greece, where he preached the gospel and converted many: where also he suffered martyrdom, and was buried. Soon afterwards he says, that [s] in the reign of Constantius, Luke's body was translated from Thebes to Constantinople. The connection leads us by Thebes, to understand Thebes in Greece.

Grotius says, he thinks, that [t] about the time that Paul left Rome, Luke also went thence into Achaia, and there wrote his books, which we have, as Jerom likewise says. Cave thought, that [u] both St. Luke's books were written at Rome, and before Paul's captivity there was at an end.

But by Mill, Grabe, and Wetstein, it is said, that Luke published his gospel at Alexandria, in Egypt. Let us observe their proofs.

First of all [v] Mill and [w] Wetstein quote Œcumenius, as saying, that Luke preached at Thebes in Egypt. Nevertheless I do not find it in Œcumenius. And I suppose, that Simeon Metaphrastes, a writer of no great credit, in the

[n] Vol. iv. ch. xcviii. num. ii. [o] Ετω Πετρϐ ἡ Ιϐδαια, τι Παυλῳ κοινον προς τα εθνη, Λϐκᾳ προς Αχαιαν—Μαρκῳ προς Ιταλιαν; Gregor. Or. 25. p. 438. A. [p] Vol. iv. ch. cxviii. num. v. 1. [q] Vol. iii. ch. lxix. num. ix. 14. [r] Συνδιαγων δ' εν Ῥωμη τῳ Παυλῳ, επανηκει τῃ Ἑλλαδι αυθις. κ. λ. Niceph. l. 2. cap. 43. p. 210. [s] Ibid. C.

[t] Puto autem Româ iisse Lucam in Achaiam, atque ibi ab eo conscriptos, quos habemus, libros. Quod et Hieronymus prodidit. Grot. Præf. in Evang. Luc. [u] Utrumque anno Christi 59, S. Paulo nondum ex carcere dimisso, scripsisse videtur. In Luca. H. L. p. 25.

[v] Certe post discessum a Româ Libyam petiisse nostrum hunc evangelistam, ac apud Thebanos verbum prædicâsse, testatur Œcumenius, Comment. in Lucam. Mill. Prol. n. 114. [w] —vel secundum Hieronymum— in Achaiæ Bœotiæque finibus, qui tamen Thebas Ægyptias, ubi, teste Œcumenio, Lucas prædicavit, pro Bœotiis accepisse videtur. Wetst. N. T. tom. I. p. 643.

tenth century, in his life of St. Luke, is their authority: for he is the writer quoted by[x] Grabe, though he does it cautiously. Nor does Metaphrastes say, that St. Luke published his gospel in Egypt: he supposeth it to have been written before he went thither. For he says, that[y] when Luke preached there, he sometimes argued from the Old Testament, and sometimes from the gospel which he had written. It may be reckoned probable, therefore, that this journey of St. Luke into Egypt is a mere fiction, a thing without ground ascribed to him by some, after he had left Paul, and after he had written his gospel.

Nevertheless those learned men[z] have been pleased to argue from this passage of Metaphrastes, that Jerom mistook Thebes in Bœotia for Thebes in Egypt: which appears to me to be altogether arbitrary. I should rather think, that some later writer mistook the place, and instead of Thebes in Bœotia, thought of Thebes in Egypt, a very famous city, and better known to himself than the other.

It may be of use to take here more at large the passage of Nicephorus, in part quoted just now. 'Luke,'[a] says he, 'was born at Antioch, which is in Syria, by profession a 'physician, and also well skilled in painting. He came to 'Paul at Thebes with its seven gates: where, renouncing 'the error of his ancestors, he embraced the christian doc-'trine, and of a physician for the body, became a physician 'for the soul. He likewise wrote a gospel, as Paul dictated 'it to him, and also the Acts of the Apostles. Whilst 'Paul was at Rome, [or, when Paul had been at Rome,] 'he returned into[b] Greece.' This, I think, must confirm our supposition, that somebody mistook Thebes in Egypt

[x] Taceo recentiores, veluti Simeonem Metaphrasten, qui in Vitâ S. Lucæ Græce et Latine editâ ad calcem commentariorum Œcumenii, p. 857, D. ita scribit: totam Libyam percurrens in Ægyptum pervenit, &c. Grabe, Spic. T. I. p. 33.

[y] Και νυν μεν απο της παλαιας παραγων γραφης, νυν δε αφ' ϖπερ ϖτος ανεταξατο ευαγγελιϖ διερμηνευων αυτοις τα περι Χριϛϖ. Sim. Metaphr. de Vit. S. Lucæ, p. 858. B.

[z] Neque aliunde in aliam sententiam ductum arbitror Hieronymum, qui in Achaiæ Bœotiæque finibus hoc evangelium conditum ait, quam quod, seu lecto, seu ex traditione alicubi accepto, Lucam apud Thebanos prædicâsse, ac conscripsisse evangelium, incolas istos fuisse existimârit Thebarum Bœotiarum, non autem Thebarum, urbis Ægypti superioris. Mill. Prol. n. 115. Vid. et Wetsten. citat. supra note [w].

[a] Niceph. l. 2. cap. 43. p. 210. A. B.

[b] All must be sensible that this story of Nicephorus is very strange. For in one place he without hesitation speaks of St. Luke as the companion of Cleophas, mentioned, Luke xxiv. 18, lib. I. cap. 34, p. 117. A. And he several times speaks of Mark and Luke as two of Christ's seventy disciples. Lib. II. cap. 43. in. et cap. 45. p. 213. B. και εκ των ὁ δυο ἑτερες, Μαρκον και Λϵκαν.

for Thebes in Bœotia. It is plain, that Nicephorus means Thebes of Greece. And he seems to have supposed in this place, that Luke was converted about the time that he came to be with Paul in Macedonia and Greece. See Acts xvi. 10. He says, Luke returned into Greece. Therefore the Thebes before mentioned must have been in that country: nor was Paul ever at Thebes in Egypt. Luke therefore could not meet him, and be converted by him there. He calls it Thebes with its seven gates: so [c] Thebes in Bœotia was sometimes called.

Secondly. Another argument, that St. Luke's gospel was written at Alexandria, is, that [d] it is so said in the Syriac version.

But those titles are of no great weight. Before the three catholic epistles, received by the Syrians, is a title or inscription, importing, that [e] they were written by the apostles, James, Peter, and John, witnesses of our Saviour's transfiguration, taking James to be the son of Zebedee: whereas the epistle of James could not be written till long after his death, who was beheaded by Herod Agrippa, as related, Acts xii. 1, 2. And St. Paul's second epistle to Timothy [f] is said by the same Syrians to have been written at Rome, and sent by Luke: which is manifestly contrary to the epistle itself. See 2 Tim. iv. 11, 12.

St. Luke's gospel is also said in the Persic version [g] to have been written at Alexandria. But then it is allowed, that this version was made from the Syriac, not from the Greek.

Thirdly. It is also argued, that there are *epigraphai* or inscriptions in some manuscripts, at the end of this gospel, where it is said, that it was written in the great city of Alexandria.

But it is well known, that those inscriptions at the end of the books of the New Testament are of little value, divers of them containing manifest mistakes: and they are in

[c] Vid. Cellar. Geogr. Antiq. lib. II. cap. 13.

[d] Ita quippe sonat titulus ejus in versione Syriacâ, ante mille annos editâ: Evangelium Lucæ evangelistæ quod protulit et evangelizavit Græce in Alexandriâ magnâ. Grabe, Spic. T. I. p. 33. Conf. Mill. Prol. n. 114.

[e] Sanctorum apostolorum, Jacobi, Petri, Joannis, transfigurationis Christi spectatorum, epistolæ singulæ.

[f] Ad Timotheum vero secunda, Romæ scripta, fuit missa per eundem Lucam medicum et evangelistam. Ebedjesu, Catal. ap. Asseman. Bib. Or. T. III. p. 12.

[g] Et in versione Persicâ, quam tamen non ex Græco, sed Syriaco textu translatam existimat admodum R. Waltonus: Evangelium Lucæ, quod linguâ Græcâ Ægyptiacâ in Alexandriâ scripsit. Grab. ubi supr. p. 33.

late manuscripts only, or however, such as are not of the highest antiquity.

Fourthly. Grabe[h] likewise insists upon a passage in the Apostolical Constitutions, where the apostles are brought in, relating what bishops had been appointed by them in their own time. And it is said, that in Alexandria, Anianus, the first bishop, was ordained by the evangelist Mark, and Abilius by Luke, also evangelist. And[i] Mill in like manner quotes the Constitutions, after Grabe, though almost ashamed so to do.

But it should be considered, that the author of that work is anonymous, and unknown, and his time not certain. He says what he pleaseth, and has been convicted of falsehood in such accounts[k] as these, as well as in others. It has very much the appearance of fiction, that the first bishop of Alexandria should be ordained by Mark, and the second by Luke: and possibly it is a fiction of the writer himself; for I do not recollect, that this is said any where else. Epiphanius, as well as more ancient writers, must have been totally unacquainted with this ordination, and with St. Luke's journies in Egypt: for he says, that[l] this evangelist preached the gospel in Dalmatia, Gaul, Italy, and Macedonia, but especially in Gaul.

Du Pin having taken notice of what is said relating to this matter in the inscriptions, which are in some manuscripts, the titles in the Syriac and Persic versions, Metaphrastes, and the Constitutions, concludes: 'All[m] these 'monuments deserve no credit. We ought to adhere to 'what is said by Jerom, as most probable: that this gospel 'was composed in Achaia, or Bœotia.'

Upon the whole, there appears not any good reason to say, that St. Luke wrote his gospel at Alexandria, or that he preached at all in Egypt. It is more probable, that when he left Paul, he went into Greece, and there composed, or finished, and published his gospel, and the Acts of the Apostles.

VII. I would now offer something by way of character

[h] Atque hoc non parum confirmatur ex eo quod, lib. vii. Const. Apost. Clement. cap. 46. Lucas dicatur Alexandriæ fuisse, ibique episcopum Avilium ordinâsse. 'Urbis Alexandrinorum Anianus primus a Marco evangelistâ ordinatus est, secundus vero Avilius a Lucâ, et ipso evangelistâ.' Grabe, ibid. [i] Et si Constitutionum Apostolicarum seu auctori seu consarcinatori fides, in ecclesiâ Alexandrinâ a Marco primum fundatâ—Avilium Aniani primi episcopi successorem, ordinaverit. Mill. Prol. n. 141.

[k] See in this work, Vol. iv. p. 208, 209.

[l] Hær. L. I. num. xi. p. 433.

[m] Disserta. sur la Bible, liv. 2. ch. 2. sect. v. p. 39.

of this evangelist: but I shall do it briefly and cautiously; and if I mention doubtful things doubtfully, I may hope to escape censure. It is probable, that he is Lucius, mentioned, Rom. xvi. 21. If so, he was related to St. Paul the apostle. And it is not unlikely, that that Lucius is the same as Lucius of Cyrene, mentioned by name, Acts xiii. 1, and in general with others, ch. xi. 20. It appears to me very probable, that St. Luke was a Jew by birth, and an early Jewish believer. This must be reckoned to be a kind of requisite qualification for writing a history of Christ and the early preaching of his apostles to advantage; which, certainly, St. Luke has performed. I do not perceive sufficient reason to believe, that Luke was one of Christ's seventy disciples. But he may have been one of the two, whom our Lord met in the way to Emmaus, on the day of his resurrection, as related, Luke xxiv. 13—35. He is expressly styled by the apostle "his fellow-labourer," Philem. ver. 24. If he be the person intended, Col. iv. 14, (which seems very probable,) he was, or had been by profession a physician. And he was greatly valued by the apostle, who calls him beloved: which must be reckoned much to his honour. For nothing could be so likely to recommend any man to St. Paul's esteem, as faithfulness to the interests of pure religion. It is undoubted, that he accompanied Paul when he first went into Macedonia, Acts xvi. 8—40. And though we are not fully assured, that he continued to be with him constantly afterwards, we know that he went with the apostle from Greece through Macedonia, and Asia, to Jerusalem, and thence to Rome, where he stayed with him the whole two years of his imprisonment in that city. This alone makes out the space of above five years. And it is an attendance well becoming Lucius of Cyrene; to which no man could be more readily disposed, than one of the first preachers of the gospel to the Gentiles. We do not exactly know when St. Luke formed the design of writing his two books; but, probably, they are the labour of several years. During St. Paul's imprisonment in Judea, which lasted more than two years, and was a time of inaction for the apostle, St. Luke had an opportunity for completing his collections, and filling up his plan. For in that time unquestionably Luke conversed with many early Jewish believers, and eye-witnesses of the Lord, and some of the apostles, who were still at Jerusalem. And I make no doubt, but that before that season he had conversed with several of the apostles, and other eye-witnesses of our Lord's person and works. Nor can any hesitate to allow the truth

of what is said by some of the ancients, that Luke, who for the most part was a companion of Paul, had likewise more than a slight acquaintance with the rest of the apostles. Whilst he was with Paul at Rome, it is likely, that he had some leisure for composing and writing. When St. Paul left Rome, I imagine that Luke accompanied him no longer: but went into Greece, where he finished, and published, one after the other, his two books. Which he inscribed to Theophilus, an honourable friend, and a good christian in that country. Here Luke died, and perhaps somewhat in years. Nor need it to be reckoned an improbable supposition, that he was older than the apostle.

VIII. I shall conclude this chapter with some observations upon St. Luke's gospel, and the Acts of the Apostles. But those upon his gospel will chiefly relate to the introduction: though some were mentioned formerly.

1. St. Luke's two books, his gospel and the Acts, are inscribed to Theophilus: whereby some understand any good christian in general, others a particular person.

Epiphanius [n] speaks as if he was in doubt, whether thereby should be understood a particular person, or a lover of God in general. Salvian [o] seems to have supposed it to be only a feigned name.

Augustin [p] and Chrysostom, [q] and many others, have thereby understood a real person. Theophylact expresseth himself after this manner: 'Theophilus, [r] to whom Luke 'wrote, was a man of senatorian rank, and possibly a go-'vernor: forasmuch as he calls him most excellent, the 'same title which Paul useth in his addresses to Felix and 'Festus.' Œcumenius says, 'that [s] Theophilus was a pre-'fect or governor.' However, we have no particular account in the ancients, who he was, or of what country.

Cave [t] supposed Theophilus to have been a nobleman of Antioch. And in his Lives of the Apostles and Evangelists, [u] written in English, he refers to the Recognitions:

[n] Ειτ' αν τινα Θεοφιλῳ τοτε γραφων τϐτο ελεγεν, η παντι ανθρωπῳ Θεον αγαπωντι. Epiph. Hær. LI. n. vii. p. 429. A.

[o] Positus itaque in hoc ambiguæ opinionis incerto, optimum fere credidit, ut beati evangelistæ sacratissimum sequeretur exemplum: qui in utroque divini operis exordio Theophili nomen inscribens, cum ad hominem scripsisse videatur, ad amorem Dei scripsit; hoc scilicet dignissimum esse judicans, ut ad ipsum affectum Dei scripta dirigeret, a quo ad scribendum impulsus esset. Salvian. ad Salon. ep. 9. p. 215.

[p] De Consens. Evan. l. 4. c. 8. T. III. [q] Chrys. in Act. Hom. i. T. IX. p. 3, 4. [r] See this Vol. p. 160.

[s] Ἡγεμων ην ουτος ο Θεοφιλος, &c. Comm. in Act. T. II. p. 2. C.

[t] Utrumque opus inscripsit Theophilo optimati (ut credere fas est) Antiocheno. Hist. Lit. in Lucâ. [u] P. 224.

where is mentioned a rich man of Antioch of this name. But I do not esteem that to be any proof that St. Luke's Theophilus was of Antioch. That fabulous writer is not speaking of Paul, nor of Luke, but of Peter: who, as he says, in [v] seven days converted ten thousand people at Antioch. And Theophilus, the greatest man in the city, turned his house into a church. Moreover, supposing him to intend St. Luke's Theophilus, his authority is of no value. A writer at the end of the second century does not speak of his own knowledge. And if St. Luke published his books in Greece, which to me seems probable, I should be inclined to think, that Theophilus, to whom they are addressed, was a man of the same country.

2. It may be of more importance to inquire, whom St. Luke means by the many, who before him had attempted to write histories of Jesus Christ. Epiphanius says, that [w] St. Luke intended Cerinthus, Merinthus, and others. How Origen [x] expressed himself concerning this, in his preface to St. Luke's gospel; and how Jerom [y] in his preface to St. Matthew, may be seen by those, who are pleased to look back. They say, that many attempted to write gospels, as Basilides, Apelles, and others. And they mention divers gospels, not received by the church: such as the gospel of Thomas, and Matthias, the gospel of the Egyptians, and of the twelve. But it is not necessary to be supposed by us, that they thought that all, if any of those gospels were written before St. Luke's, or that he spoke of them; for Basilides and Apelles could not write gospels before the second century: and they might suppose, that several, if not all the others, mentioned by them, were written after St. Luke's. The meaning of what these ancient writers say, is, that the church receives four gospels only. There were many others. But to them may be applied the words of St. Luke: they only took in hand, or attempted. They did not perform as Matthew, and Mark, and Luke, and John did. And they might express themselves in that manner concerning gospels written after St. Luke's, as well as before it.

[v] Et ne multis immorer, intra septem dies, plus quam decem millia hominum credentes Deo baptizati sunt, et sanctificatione consecrati; ita ut omni aviditatis desiderio Theophilus, qui erat cunctis potentibus in civitate sublimior, domûs suæ ingentem basilicam, ecclesiæ nomine, consecravit. Recogn. l. x. cap. 71.

[w] —*φασκων επειδηπερ πολλοι επεχειρησαν· ινα τινας μεν επιχειρητας δειξῃ, φημι δε τους περι Κηρινθον, και Μηρινθον, και τους αλλους.* H. Ll. n. vii. in.

[x] See Vol. ii. p. 533, 534.

[y] See Vol. iv. ch. cxiv. num. ix. 8.

However, Theophylact, as was formerly [z] observed, in the preface to his Commentary upon St. Luke, expresseth himself as if he thought the evangelist referred to the gospels according to the Egyptians, and according to the twelve.

3. We will now observe the judgments of some learned moderns. Grabe [a] allows, that St. Luke did not refer to the gospels of Basilides, or Thomas, or some others, mentioned by Origen, for they were not published till after St. Luke's death. But he thinks, that St. Luke might refer to the gospels according to the Egyptians, and according to the twelve, and some others not known.

That St. Luke might refer to the gospel according to the Egyptians, he thinks for the following reasons, which I shall consider.

The first is, that [b] St. Luke's gospel was written in Egypt. To which I answer, that is said without ground, as has been lately [c] shown.

Grabe's second argument is, that [d] Clement of Rome, or some other, in the fragment of the second epistle ascribed to him, has quoted the gospel according to the Egyptians. Which argument, as one would think, might have been spared: since Grabe himself allows that [e] second epistle to be supposititious, and not to have been composed till about the middle of the third century. If that be the true date of the epistle, it is too late a thing to warrant the supposition, that St. Luke referred to the gospel according to the Egyptians.

I shall take no farther notice of Grabe. But I imagine that the gospel according to the Egyptians was not composed before the second century. Clement of Alexandria

[z] This Vol. p. 159.

[a] Reliqua quippe, ab Origene et Ambrosio nominata falsa evangelia, veluti Basilidis, aliudque Manichæorum, apostolo Thomæ perperam adscriptum, procul omni dubio post S. Lucæ obitum prodiere; adeo ut ea in primis evangelii verbis, in quorum explicatione Origenes et Ambrosius ista afferunt, respicere haud potuerit. Contra vero haud est absimile, ista secundum Hebræos et Ægyptios ante fuisse scripta, atque ad ea unâ cum aliis pluribus jam ignotis, Lucam intendisse digitum, dum præfatus est, &c. Gr. Spic. T. I. p. 31, 32.

[b] Evangelium, de quo agitur, ab Ægyptiis editum fuisse ante Lucæ evangelium, huncque istud inter alia, si non præcipue, respexisse, dum in procemio plures historias evangelicas memorat, ad quas emendandas, et defectus eorum supplendos suam literis consignâsse se innuit, probabile redditur ex eo, quod Lucas evangelium scripsisse dicatur Alexandriæ in Ægypto. Id. ib. p. 33. in.

[c] See before, p. 380.

[d] Accedit, quod jam Clemens Romanus, vel quisquis est auctor ep. 2. ad Corinthios, certe antiquissimus, isto evangelio usus esse ex fragmento mox recitando, colligatur. Ibid. p. 34.

[e] Cæterum quæras, quando epistola illa Clementi supposita fuerat, respondeo, id seculo iii. et quidem medio, factum esse. Ib. p. 299. in.

is the first known catholic author that has cited it; and in his time it was very obscure and little known. This [f] was shown formerly.

Dr. Mill does not much differ from Grabe. He thinks, that [g] of the many narrations, to which St. Luke refers, the two principal were the gospels according to the Hebrews, and according to the Egyptians.

The general account which Mill gives of those memoirs or narrations, seems to be very just and reasonable; and I intend to transcribe him here largely: 'About [h] the year 58, 'or somewhat sooner,' says Mill, 'were composed by some 'of the faithful evangelical narrations, or short histories of 'Christ. This appears from St. Luke's introduction to his 'gospel. From which we learn, in the first place, that 'they were not our evangelists, Matthew and Mark: for 'Matthew was an eye-witness; nor can two be called many. 'In the next place it is to be observed, that these narrations 'consisted of things most surely believed among us, that is, 'as I understand it, of the things fulfilled and done by 'Christ among the first professors of the faith; of which 'number Luke reckons himself. Lastly, from the words of

[f] See Vol. ii. p. 251.

[g] Ex dictis autem hisce historiolis—duæ præ cæteris celebratæ erant quæ et ipsæ evangelia appellabantur, secundum Hebræos alterum, alterum secundum Ægyptios. Proleg. n. 38. vid. et n. 39—41. et n. 112, &c.

[h] Sub hoc quidem tempus, annum dico LVIII. seu etiam aliquanto ante, contextæ fuere a fidelibus quibusdam istius ævi διηγησεις evangelicæ, seu historiolæ de rebus Christi. Patet hoc ex evangelii D. Lucæ proœmio:—Exinde colligimus, in primis equidem, πολλους hosce, qui historias conficiebant, alios prorsus fuisse ab evangelistis nostris, Matthæo et Marco. Erat enim Matthæus unus ex αυτοπταις, ideoque nec ab istorum traditionibus pendebat, sicut hi quos memorat Lucas. Ne dicam, quod duos duntaxat nemo πολλους dixerat. Deinde veto notandum, eos narrationes suas instituisse περι των πεπληροφορημενων εν ἡμιν πραγματων, hoc est, ut ego lubens interpretor, 'de rebus apud primos fidei professores, quorum numero seipsum accenset Lucas, a Christo impletis sive gestis.' Denique liquet ex verbis modo citatis, traductas fuisse narratiunculas istas seu proxime, seu mediate saltem, ab apostolis ipsis, eorumque in opere evangelico adjutoribus. Manifestum est igitur, fuisse e primis christianis nonnullos, qui ante Lucam, [addo etiam Matthæum et Marcum,] res Christi, (seu evangelia,) ex apostolicis traditionibus undecunque acceptas conscripserant; idque non studio aliquo maligno, seu hæretico, quod insinuant fere qui in hoc Lucæ proœmium commentati sunt: sed eodem plane fine, quo evangelistæ nostri; ut haberet scilicet ecclesia rerum a Domino nostro gestarum qualem notitiam. Cæterum cum in iis quæ sequuntur apud Lucam, singula christianæ rei historiam spectantia accurate se assecutum esse dicat evangelista—haud obscure quidem hinc colligi videtur, των πολλων istorum διηγησεις minus accuratas fuisse, minusque perfectas; ita quidem, ut in his, quæ tradiderant, aliqua hinc inde occurrerint parum certa, ne dicam a vero aberrantia. Unde omnino visum sit ipsi, plenariam historiæ hujusce cognitionem consecuto, integrum jam et luculentum rerum a Christo gestarum commentarium scribere. Mill. Proleg. num. 35—37.

'that introduction it appears, that those narrations were received either from the apostles themselves, or from their 'assistants in the work of the gospel. It is therefore manifest, that there were some of the first christians, who before Luke (and also, as we may suppose, before Matthew 'and Mark) wrote histories of the things done by Christ 'and received from apostolical traditions: and that not 'with a bad or heretical design, as many insinuate, who 'comment upon this introduction of St. Luke, but with the 'same design as our evangelist: that christians might have 'at least some account in writing of the Lord's actions. 'Nevertheless it may be also inferred, from what St. Luke 'here says, that their histories were inaccurate and imperfect, there were in them some things not certain, or well 'attested, and possibly here and there some mistakes. For 'which cause it seemed good to him, who had attained 'to full information, to write a complete and copious history 'of the things done by Christ.'

If this account be right, some consequences may be deduced, which will be of use to us.

And indeed it seems to me to be very right. There were several histories of Christ, to which St. Luke here refers. They were composed with a good view, like to that of our evangelists. But they were defective and inaccurate. If there were any mistakes, I would imagine that they were not numerous, nor in things of the greatest importance. Nor were the writers sufficiently qualified for the work which they had undertaken. This, I think, to be intimated by St. Luke, though modestly, and without censoriousness, in what he says of himself, "that he had perfect understanding of all things from the very first:" which, probably, could not be said of the composers of the narrations, to which he refers. They were men who had an honest zeal; but they had written too hastily before they had obtained full information: for which reason their histories could not answer the end aimed at.

These things being allowed to be right, several consequences may be deduced by us.

In the first place, and in particular, we hence learn, that the gospel according to the twelve, or according to the Hebrews, was not one of those narrations, or memoirs, to which St. Luke refers. For these were very short histories ['historiolæ,' as Mill calls them]: that was a full gospel, or large history of Jesus Christ. Many, in Jerom's time, supposed it to be the authentic gospel of St. Matthew: which, certainly, is not a short and imperfect memoir. From the

notice taken of that gospel by several ancient writers, especially by Jerom, it appears to me very probable (and I should think must appear very probable to others likewise) that the gospel according to the twelve, or according to the Hebrews, either was St. Matthew's original Hebrew gospel, with additions; or his original Greek gospel, translated into Hebrew, with additions. But this last seems to me most likely, as has been often said already upon divers occasions.

Secondly. Another thing to be deduced from Mill's account, if right, is, that [i] the gospel according to the Egyptians was not one of the narrations to which St. Luke refers. For that gospel was not composed upon the same principles with those of our evangelists. It was an heretical gospel, as appears from the fragments of it, collected by Grabe, and [k] probably it was composed in the second century, by some Encratites, enemies of marriage.

Thirdly. I add one thing more, whether it be a consequence from what has been already said, or not: that nothing remains of the narrations, to which St. Luke refers, not so much as any fragments, they not being quoted in any christian writings now extant.

3. I shall now transcribe a part of Dr. Doddridge's remarks upon St. Luke's introduction. 'This [l] must refer to 'some histories of the life of Christ now lost. For Mat- 'thew and Mark, the only evangelists that can be supposed 'to have written before Luke, could not with any propriety 'be called many. And of these two, Matthew at least 'wrote from personal knowledge, not from the testimony of 'others. I conclude, that the books referred to are lost: 'as I am well satisfied that none of the apocryphal gospels, 'now extant, published particularly by Fabricius and 'Jones, can pretend to equal antiquity with this of St. 'Luke—And St. Luke seems to allow these histories, what- 'ever they were, to have been honestly written, according 'to information received from capable judges.'

4. Mr. Beausobre, speaking of these memoirs, says, 'The [m]

[i] I am not singular in supposing, that the gospel according to the Egyptians is not intended by St. Luke. Beza says the same strongly. And, as I imagine, he justly asserts it not to have been written till after St. Luke's gospel. Quod istos ait Lucas non satis commode præstitisse: minime tamen opinor, fabulosas, imo etiam impias narrationes intelligens, tandem ecclesiæ sub Nicodemi, Nazaræorum, Thomæ, Ægyptiorum, nominibus impudentissime obtrusas. Bez. ad Luc. cap. i. ver. 1.

[k] Vid. Grabe, Spic. T. I. p. 31—37.

[l] See his Family Expositor, Vol. I. p. 1.

[m] Hist. de Manich. tom. I. p. 449.

'life of our Saviour was so beautiful, his character so sub-
'lime and divine, his doctrine so excellent, and the mira-
'cles, by which he confirmed it, were so shining and so
'numerous, that it was impossible but many should under-
'take to write memoirs of them. This produced many his-
'tories of our Saviour, some more, others less exact. It is
'great pity that they are lost: for we might have consulted
'them, and could have judged for ourselves concerning the
'character of the writers, and their compositions. St. Luke,
'who speaks of narrations, or gospels that had preceded
'his own, intimates indeed, that they were defective, but he
'does not condemn them as fabulous, or bad.'

5. That is right. Those memoirs were not bad, nor fabulous: but they were imperfect, as I apprehend, to a great degree; nor do I lament the loss of them. I can pay so much deference to the judgment of christian antiquity, especially the earliest of all, as to believe, that those many narrations to which St. Luke refers, did not deserve to be preserved, or to be much taken notice of, after the publication of the gospels of our first three evangelists. I imagine, that when once these came abroad, the former appeared to the faithful so low, and mean, and defective, that they could not bear to see or read them.

IX. I shall now make some observations upon the other work of our evangelist.

1. The book of the Acts was written, according to [n] Mill, in the year 64. And from what has been argued by us in several places, that must appear to be as likely a time as any. It could not be written till after St. Paul's confinement at Rome was come to a period; I suppose it to have ended in the former part of the year of Christ 63. And I think it probable, that St. Luke finished this book the same, or the next year, either at Rome, or in Greece.

2. It cannot be disagreeable to recollect here some of the observations of ancient writers upon this book, the only book of the kind which we have, containing a history of the preaching of Christ's apostles after his resurrection.

3. Tertullian [o] often speaks of the importance of this book, as showing Christ's fulfilment of the promise of the Holy Ghost to his disciples.

4. 'The [p] Acts of the Apostles,' says Jerom in his letter

[n] Prolegom. num. 121.

[o] See Vol. ii. p. 279.

[p] Actus Apostolorum nudam quidem sonare videntur historiam, et nascentis ecclesiæ infantiam texere. Sed, si noverimus scriptorem eorum Lucam esse medicum, cujus laus est in evangelio, animadverteinus pariter, omnia verba illius animæ languentis esse medicinam. Ad Paulin. ep. 50. [al. 103.] T. IV. P. II. p. 574.

to Paulinus concerning the study of the scriptures, 'seems 'to promise a bare history, and an account of the early in-'fancy of the church: but if we consider, that the writer 'is Luke the physician, we shall at the same time discern, 'that every word is suited to heal the maladies of the 'soul.'

5. Says Augustin: 'Luke[q] after having written a gospel, 'containing a history of Christ's words and works to the 'time of his resurrection and ascension, wrote such an ac-'count of the Acts of the Apostles, as he judged to be suf-'ficient for the edification of believers. And it is the only 'history of the apostles which has been received by the 'church: all others having been rejected as not to be 'relied upon.'

6. I beg leave to refer my readers to the passages of Chrysostom, already[r] transcribed, relating to this book: and to the whole of his first homily upon it. I add now only one passage more out of the same homily. 'The[s] gos-'pels,' says he, 'are the history of the things which Christ 'did and spake. The Acts, the history of the things which 'another Paraclete spake and did.'

7. It is not needful for me to make a distinct enumeration of the things contained in this book. Every one who has perused it with care, cannot but know, that it contains an account of the choice of Matthias to be apostle in the room of the traitor, of the wonderful and plentiful pouring out of the gift of the Holy Ghost upon the apostles, and other disciples of Jesus at Jerusalem, at the pentecost next succeeding his crucifixion, and of the testimony borne by the apostles to his resurrection and ascension in their discourses, and by many miracles, and various sufferings: their preaching first at Jerusalem and in Judea, and afterwards by themselves, or their assistants, in Samaria: and then to Gentiles in Judea, and afterwards out of it, as well as to Jews: and of the conversion of Paul, and his preaching, miracles, labours, sufferings, in many cities and countries, parts of the Roman empire, and the polite world, and at length in Rome itself.

8. If we were to indulge ourselves in making remarks upon this useful and excellent performance, nothing, perhaps, would be more observable than its brevity and conciseness: by which means many things must have been

[q] See Vol. iv. ch. cxvii. num. vi. 2. [r] Ibid. ch. cxviii. num. vi.

[s] *Τα μεν ευ εναγγελια ων ὁ Χριστος εποιησεν και ειπεν ἱστορια τις εστιν· αἱ δε Πραξεις, ων ὁ ἑτερος παρακλητος ειπε και εποιησε.* In Act. Hom. i. tom. IX. p. 9. B.

omitted, which happened during the period of that history. For it is very true, which Chrysostom said, that [t] Luke leaves us thirsting for more.

9. Says Le Clerc: Luke's [u] apostolical history relates 'the beginnings of the preaching of the gospel among Jews 'and Gentiles, chiefly by the ministry of Peter and Paul: 'for of the other apostles he is almost entirely silent—I 'wish,' says he, 'that some other apostolical man, of like 'judgment and integrity, had written the history of the 'other apostles, and had undertaken to supply what was 'wanting in Luke's history, and that this work had come 'down to us.' But, however desirable it may now appear to us, we cannot perceive, from ecclesiastical history, that ever such a work was published.

10. Estius imagined, 'that [v] Luke possibly intended to 'write a third book, to supply, particularly, the omissions 'of the two years, which St. Paul spent at Rome.' But I verily believe, there is no ground at all for that conjectural supposition.

11. Again: Le Clerc, above mentioned, thinks, that [w] Luke breaks off the history of St. Peter, of whom he had said so much before, very abruptly in those words, Acts xii. 17, "And he departed, and went to another place." Nevertheless St. Luke afterwards drops St. Barnabas in a like manner, ch. xv 39. And in the end he will take his leave of the apostle Paul himself without much more ceremony.

12. These omissions are no reflection upon the writer, nor any disparagement to his history. The proper deduction to be made by us is this: we hereby perceive, that it was not the design of St. Luke to aggrandize Peter, or Paul, or any of the apostles, nor to write their lives: but to record the evidences of our Saviour's resurrection, and to write a history of the first preaching and planting the christian religion in the world. This design he has ad-

[t] Vol. iv. ch. cxviii. num. vi. 8. [u] Hic vero desinit Lucæ Historia Apostolica, quâ initia prædicationis evangelicæ apud Judæos, ethnicosque, et ministerio quidem Petri et Pauli potissimum, scribere adgressus est. De cæteris apostolis altum ubique apud eum est silentium—Utinam vero vir quispiam apostolicus, pari judicio, et fide, cæterorum res gestas literis mandâsset, quæ narrationi Lucæ desunt supplere voluisset, idque opus ad nos pervenisset. Cler. H. E. An. 61. n. iv. [v] Sed proculdubio multa actorum Pauli a Lucâ sunt omissa—Ac fortasse Lucas meditabatur tertium librum, in quo repeteret acta illius biennii—sicut Act. i. quædam exposuit tacita ultimo capite evangelii. Est. ad Act. Ap. xxviii. 30.

[w] Mirum est, Lucam, postquam liberationem Petri e carcere narravit cap. xii. 17, eumque 'in alium locum,' hoc est, extra Ierosolymam, ivisse dixit, ne verbulum quidem de eo habere, de quo tam multa alia dixerat. Id. ibid.

mirably executed: and having filled up his plan, he concluded.

13. However, undoubtedly, many things are omitted by St. Luke: some of which we may learn from St. Paul's epistles. I shall observe some omissions.

14. St. Luke has not, in the course of his history, mentioned the writing of any of St. Paul's epistles. It is probable, that he was at Corinth when the apostle wrote thence his large epistle to the Romans. Nevertheless he takes not any notice of it, nor of the epistles written by St. Paul at Rome, when he certainly was with him, nor indeed of any other. By comparing the epistles themselves, and St. Luke's history of the apostle in the Acts, we are enabled to trace the time and place of divers of those epistles: but they are no where particularly mentioned by the historian.

15. In Acts ix. 19—26, St. Luke, after the account of St. Paul's conversion, speaks of his being at Damascus, and his preaching there, and of the opposition which he there met with from the Jews, and his escape thence, and then going to Jerusalem. But St. Paul, Gal. i. 17, 18, informs us, that after his conversion he went into Arabia, and then returned to Damascus: and that three years passed between his conversion and his going to Jerusalem. This is an instructive instance: for the omission is certain, and undoubted. I am of opinion, that St. Luke did not omit the journey into Arabia because he did not know of it: but designedly, and because he did not judge it necessary to be mentioned. Jerom[x] has taken particular notice of the omission of that journey into Arabia.

16. Like omissions are in St. Luke's gospel. I shall take notice of two.

1.) Having given the history of our Lord's presentation at the temple, he says, ch. ii. 39, "And when they had performed all things according to the law of the Lord, they returned into Galilee, to their own city, Nazareth." Nevertheless, I think the holy family did not now go directly from Jerusalem to Nazareth, but to Bethlehem. There, as I suppose, our Lord received the homage of the magians. And afterwards, to avoid the persecution of Herod, they removed thence to Egypt, and then returned to Nazareth. All which is recorded, Matt. ii. 1—13.

[x] Lucam vero idcirco de Arabiâ præterisse, quia forsitan nihil dignum apostolatu in Arabiâ perpetrârat; et ea potius compendiosâ narratione dixisse, quæ digna Christi evangelio videbantur. Nec hoc segnitiæ apostoli deputandum, si frustra in Arabiâ fuerit; sed quod aliqua dispensatio et Dei præceptum fuerit, ut taceret. Hier. in Ep. ad cal. cap. i. T. IV. p. 235.

The visit of the magians must have been after the presentation at the temple. If it had been before, and if they had presented "their gifts, gold, and frankincense, and myrrh," mentioned, Matt. ii. 11, Mary would not have made the lesser offering for her purification, mentioned, Luke ii. 23, 34. Nor could the child Jesus have been safely brought to Jerusalem, or such notice have been taken of him at the temple, as St. Luke particularly relates, ch. ii. 25—38, if "Herod and all Jerusalem" had been just before alarmed by the inquiries of the magians: "Where is he that is born king of the Jews?" Matt. ii. 1, 2. Omitting therefore all those things, St. Luke says, as above observed, And afterwards they returned to Nazareth, the place of their usual abode: which is agreeable to Matt. ii. 22, 23.

2.) Another thing observable is, that all our Saviour's appearances to his disciples, after his resurrection, recorded by St. Luke, ch. xxiv. were at Jerusalem or near it. He takes not any notice of our Saviour's meeting the disciples in Galilee, so particularly mentioned, Matt. xxviii. 7, and Mark xvi. 7. St. John also, ch. xxi. 1—23, speaks of our Saviour's showing himself to the disciples at "the sea of Tiberias." And St. Paul assures us, that our Lord was "seen of above five hundred brethren at once," 1 Cor. xv. 6; which, probably, was in the same country. And though at the beginning of his book of the Acts, St. Luke resumes the account of our Saviour's showing himself to the disciples after his resurrection, there is nothing more about Galilee, than in the former relation. Insomuch, that, if we had St. Luke's histories only, we might have been apt to conclude, that all the appearances of our Saviour to his disciples were at Jerusalem or near it, and no where else.

17. St. Paul's epistles inform us of many things omitted by St. Luke. But we should have known many more, if we had had a parallel historian. A comparison of St. Luke's history of our Saviour, with that of the other evangelists, may assure of this.

18. In the eleventh chapter of the second epistle to the Corinthians, St. Paul mentions divers visions and revelations, with which he had been favoured: but St. Luke has not taken notice of any of them. St. Paul, in his speech to the people at Jerusalem, recorded by St. Luke, Acts xxii. 17, mentions a trance which he had in the temple. But St. Luke has no where told us the exact time of it; nor has he otherwise mentioned it.

19. I do not think that these things were omitted by St. Luke because St. Paul concealed them from him; or

because by some other means he was unacquainted with the time and place of them : but it was a regard to brevity that induced him to pass them over. They were not necessary to be inserted in his history : without them he has recorded sufficient attestations of Paul's apostolical authority, and of the truth and divine original of the doctrine taught by him.

20. Says St. Paul, unwillingly, and constrained by the disadvantageous insinuations and charges of self-interested and designing men, 2 Cor. xi. 23, "Are they ministers of Christ? (I speak as a fool :) I am more. In labours more abundant, in stripes above measure, in prisons more frequent, in deaths oft."

"In prisons more frequent." Therefore before writing this epistle, in the year 57, Paul had been imprisoned several times: though St. Luke has mentioned before this time one imprisonment only, which was at Philippi, Acts xvi. 23—40. Upon which Estius [y] observes, that Paul did and suffered many things not mentioned in the Acts. And Rom. xvi. 7, "Salute Andronicus and Junia, my kinsmen and my fellow-prisoners—who also were in Christ before me." Paul was not a prisoner when he wrote the epistle to the Romans, in the beginning of the year 58. But [z] he had been in prison before with those two early christians, his relations : but where, or when, we cannot exactly say.

21. Ver. 24, "Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one." Nevertheless St. Luke has not mentioned one of those times. Estius conjectures that [a] Luke omitted these, and many other things, because he was not with the apostle when they happened, and Paul out of modesty forbore to tell him of them. I rather think that Luke was fully acquainted with Paul's history: but he aimed at brevity, and judged the things mentioned by him to be sufficient.

22. Ver. 25, "Thrice was I beaten with rods:" mean-

[y] De Paulo autem incarcerato ante hanc epistolam, in Actis Apostolorum non legimus quidem, nisi cap. xvi. ubi a Philippensibus in carcerem missus legitur. Sed permulta Paulus et fecit et passus est, quæ in Actis non scribuntur. Est. ad 2 Cor. xi. 23. [z] Porro concaptivos intellige, quod aliquando communia cum Paulo vincula pro Christo passi fuissent. Ubi tamen, aut quando factum sit, ignoratur. Est. ad Rom. xvi. 7.

[a] Sed cur Lucas in Actis ne unius quidem flagellationis ex quinque meminit? Ideo videlicet, quod de Paulo pene ea sola, quibus ipse præsens fuit, sigillatim recenseat; alia vero vel silentio pertranseat, vel summatim ac breviter referat—Quâ in re notanda humilitas Pauli, qui suas tot et tam graves pro Christo passiones Lucæ comiti suo non aperuerit, ne hic quidem recitaturus, nisi coëgisset eum amor salutis Corinthiorum. Id. ib. ad ver. 24.

ing, I suppose, by Roman magistrates. But St. Luke has mentioned one instance only of this; which was at Philippi, when Paul and Silas both underwent this hard usage. Acts xvi. 19—40. Of this [b] likewise Estius has taken notice in his Commentary.

" Once was I stoned:" undoubtedly meaning at Lystra in Lycaonia, as related by St. Luke, Acts xiv. 19, 20.

" Thrice I have suffered shipwreck." St. Luke has recorded but one instance, which was not until after this time, in the apostle's voyage from Judea to Rome: Acts xxvii. which therefore must have been the fourth.

" A night and day have I been in the deep." At one of those times I escaped with the utmost difficulty, by getting on a plank, and floating in the sea a night and a day, or a whole day of four and twenty hours.

23. Ver. 26, " In journeyings often, in perils of waters," or rather " rivers." Which [c] are sometimes very dangerous. But St. Luke has not recorded any dangers of the apostle upon rivers, either in crossing them, or sailing upon them.

24. Says Tillemont, in his life of St. Paul: ' The [d] greatest part of interpreters think, that St. Paul made no voyages, but those which are taken notice of in the Acts.—Nevertheless we must necessarily acknowledge, that beside what St. Luke informs us of the sufferings of St. Paul, this apostle was five times scourged by the Jews, twice beaten with rods, and thrice shipwrecked. All this happened before he wrote his second epistle to the Corinthians; that is, in the time of which St. Luke has written the history. Nevertheless St. Luke says nothing of all this. It is certain therefore, that either he has omitted the circumstances of the most remarkable events which he relates, or that St. Paul made several voyages, of which he has taken no notice.'

25. The reason of St. Luke's silence here I take to be the same that has been already assigned of his silence upon other occasions: it was not necessary that these things should be related. To have written an account of all the apostle's journies and dangers, would have rendered the work more voluminous and prolix than was judged proper. When St. Luke was set about composing and publishing this

[b] ' Ter virgis cæsus sum'—a Gentilibus—Erat enim Romanis consuetudo virgis cædere nocentes—Porro Lucas tantum semel meminit hujus contumeliæ Paulo illatæ, scilicet Act. xvi. ubi scribit eum unà cum Silâ virgis cæsum a Philippensibus. Est. in loc.

[c] ' Periculis fluminum'—quæ interdum non minus periculosa sunt navigantibus, quam mare. Est. in loc.

[d] Mem. Ec. T. i. St. Paul, note xviii.

book, he had all the materials before him, and his plan was formed. Agreeably to which he determined to write at large the history of St. Paul's voyage from Judea to Rome, in which are many remarkable incidents, and to omit some other of the apostle's journies and voyages: though divers of them likewise were attended with affecting circumstances.

26. The chapter, from which I have just now transcribed several things, concludes in this manner: Ver. 31—33, "The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is blessed for evermore, knows that I lie not. In Damascus the governor under Aretas the king, kept the city of the Damascenes with a garrison, desirous to apprehend me. And through a window in a basket was I let down by the wall, and escaped his hands."

I have often reflected with great satisfaction on St. Luke's not omitting this dangerous attempt upon the apostle's liberty and life: with which himself was so much affected, and which he has here mentioned with much solemnity. The history of it may be seen in Acts ix. 23—25.

I now proceed to some other things.

27. St. Paul assures us, Gal. ii. 1—3, that when he went up to Jerusalem upon occasion of the debate concerning the manner of receiving Gentile converts, he took Titus with him: which is not said by St. Luke, Acts xv. though he gives a particular account of Paul's going from Antioch to Jerusalem upon that occasion. Nor indeed has St. Luke once mentioned Titus in his history: though St. Paul wrote an epistle to him, and has mentioned him several times in his epistles sent to others.

28. Gal. ii. 11—21, St. Paul speaks of Peter's being at Antioch, before he and Barnabas had separated: but St. Luke says nothing of it. Jerom, in his Commentary upon the epistle to the Galatians, says: 'We[e] are not to wonder, that Luke has taken no notice of this. For by the 'usual privilege of historians he has omitted many 'things performed by Paul, and which we know from 'himself.'

29. Rom. xvi. 3, 4, St. Paul applauds an action of great generosity in Aquila and Priscilla: but St. Luke has not informed us of the place, or occasion of it. Doubtless he did not omit it, for want of respect to those excellent christians, whom he has mentioned more than once, ch. xviii. 18,

[e] Nec mirum esse, si Lucas hanc rem tacuerit, quum et alia multa, quæ Paulus sustinuisse se replicat, historiographi licentiâ prætermiserit. In Gal. cap. ii. T. IV. p. 244.

and 26. But that particular did not come within the compass of his design.

30. Many things, not expressly mentioned by St. Luke, may be argued and concluded to have been done, from those which he has recorded.

1.) In Acts iv. 23—30, is recorded a prayer of the apostles, in which they request, that they may be enabled to work miracles for farther confirming the doctrine taught by them. And unquestionably their prayer was heard, and their request granted, and they did work many miracles in the name of Christ, more than are related by St. Luke.

2.) Acts v. 12, "And by the hand of the apostles were many signs and wonders done among the people:" and what follows. Whence it may be concluded, that[f] many miracles were wrought, not only by Peter and John, but also by the other apostles also, beside those which are particularly recorded. See also ch. ii. 43.

3.) Says Mr. Biscoe: 'Many[g] and great miracles are 'related in the history of the Acts to be wrought by St. 'Paul and his fellow-labourers in their preaching the gos-'pel to the Gentiles. And agreeably hereto St. Paul says, '2 Cor. xii. 12, "Truly the signs of an apostle were wrought 'amongst you in all patience, in signs and wonders, and 'mighty deeds." And to the Romans, ch. xv. 18, 19.— 'I make no doubt, says that learned writer, but the apostles 'wrought miracles in every city, where they came with a 'view to preach the gospel, and make converts. St. Luke 'is so very succinct in his history of the Acts, that he often 'omits them. He gives an account of only a miracle or 'two wrought at Philippi in his whole account of St. Paul's 'journey from Antioch to the West, when he converted a 'great part of Macedonia and Achaia: though it is evident 'from St. Paul's own epistle, already quoted, that he at 'that time did many signs and wonders at Corinth. And 'that he did the same at Thessalonica is not obscurely inti-'mated in his first epistle to the Thessalonians, ch. i. 5. We 'read nothing in the Acts of the Apostles of what St. Paul 'did in Galatia the first time, more than that he went 'through it, Acts xvi. 6. And all that is added the second

[f] Œcumenius says, that Luke omitted many miracles wrought by the apostles for avoiding ostentation. Πολλων δε θαυματων επιτελεμενων ὑπο των αποστολων, ὡς και ανωτερω εμνησθη ὁ ταυτα γραφων Λεκας, [cap. ii. 43.] ϑδενος εκεινων ονοματι μνημονευει, αλλ' εκεινο γραφει μονον αφ' ϑ παντες εκινηθησαν—η και ὁτι ϑ κομπϑ χαριν ἡ συγγραφη αυτῳ αυτη εσπϑδασθη. Œcum. in Act. Cap. iii. tom. i. p. 25. A. B.

[g] The History of the Acts confirmed, ch. xi. sect. 8. p. 407, 408.

'time he was there is, that "he went over all the coun-
'try of Galatia strengthening all the disciples," ch. xviii.
'23. Which indeed is an intimation, that the first time he
'was there he preached the gospel among them, and made
'converts. But from his epistle to the Galatian churches
'it is fully evident that he wrought miracles among them,
'and conferred on them gifts of the Holy Spirit. For he
'asks them: "He that ministereth to you the Spirit, and
'worketh miracles among you, doth he it by the works of
'the law, or by the hearing of faith?" Gal. iii. 5. That he
'means himself, is manifest from the whole tenor of the
'epistle. See ch. i. 6; ch. iv. 11, 13, 14, 19.'

There follow other like observations, which I may not transcribe.

4.) Mr. Biscoe, as above, makes no doubt but the apostles wrought miracles in every city where they came, with a view to preach the gospel, and make converts. I am of opinion, that this may be truly supposed of Paul particularly, and that it may be concluded from what St. Luke has written. For, according to him, Paul wrought miracles in Cyprus, Acts xiii. 11, at Lystra, xiv. 10, at Philippi, xvi. 16—18, (See also 25, 26,) and very many at Ephesus, xix. 11—17. And at Troas he raised Eutychus to life, xx. 9—12. In his voyage from Judea to Rome he wrought many miracles, xxviii. 3—6, and 7—10. From these miracles, recorded by St. Luke, it may be well argued, that St. Paul wrought miracles in all, or most other places, where he went, and made any stay, preaching the gospel. In particular, it may be argued, that Paul wrought miracles at Athens and at Rome. What they were we cannot say, because they have not been recorded by St. Luke, nor by any other credible writer. But that miracles were performed by the apostles in those cities, appears to me very probable.

5.) St. Luke[h] has not given any account of St. Paul's appearing before the emperor Nero at Rome, when he was sent thither by Festus. Nevertheless, that Paul was brought before Nero soon after his arrival at Rome, is highly probable. And though St. Luke has not expressly said so, it may be concluded from what he has said. For he has again and again sufficiently intimated that Paul was certainly to appear before the emperor, to whom he had appealed. See Acts xxv. 10, 11, 12, 21; xxvi. 32; xxvii. 24, xxviii. 19. The apostle therefore was brought before

[h] Mirum, quod Lucas hic nullam faciat mentionem primæ defensionis Pauli, de quâ ipse, 2 Tim. iv. quam factam fuisse primo anno quo Romam venit, non dubitandum. Est. ad Act. xxviii. 30.

Nero, and pleaded before him. But St. Luke forbore to give a distinct account of it, because he had already given a particular account of Paul's pleadings before Felix and Festus, and Agrippa; and from them may be concluded what was the tenor of his apology before the emperor himself.

6.) St. Paul, in his epistle to the christians at Rome, says, ch. i. 11, "I long to see you, that I may impart unto you some spiritual gift, to the end ye may be established." And ch. xv. 29, "I am sure, that when I come unto you, I shall come in the fulness of the blessing of the gospel of Christ." And unquestionably, the event was agreeable to these wishes and expectations.

7.) St. Luke has not particularly recorded these things in his history: but from what he has said they may be inferred. Says our historian, Acts xxviii. 13—16, "And we came the next day to Puteoli. Where we found brethren, and were desired to tarry with them seven days. And so we went toward Rome. And from thence, when the brethren heard of us, they came to meet us, as far as Appii Forum, and the Three Taverns. Whom when Paul saw, he thanked God, and took courage. And when we came to Rome, the centurion delivered the prisoners to the captain of the guard. But Paul was suffered to dwell by himself, with a soldier that kept him." And ver. 30, "Paul dwelt two whole years in his own hired house."

8.) From the things here said it may be fairly concluded, that during the apostle's stay at Rome, there was a very delightful communication of civil and religious offices between him and the believers there, according to the abilities and the exigences of each. Before he left Rome, the Philippians seem to have sent him a supply by Epaphroditus. Philip. iv. 10—18. But it may be well supposed, that the price of his lodging, and the expenses of his maintenance, were provided for, chiefly, by the christians, whom he found at Rome, when he came thither, and by the converts which he made afterwards. The soldiers, likewise, who by turns attended upon him, would expect to be considered, if they carried it civilly toward their prisoner. All which, we may suppose, was taken care of by the good christians at Rome, who, as St. Luke assures us, went out to meet him, and conducted him into the city.

CHAP. IX.

ST. JOHN, APOSTLE AND EVANGELIST.

I. *His history from the N. T.* II. *His age.* III. *When he left Judea, to go to Ephesus.* IV. *His history from ecclesiastical writers.* V. *The time when he was banished into Patmos.* VI. *How long he was there.* VII. *Testimonies of ancient writers to his gospel.* VIII. *Opinions of learned moderns concerning the time when this gospel was written.* IX. *An argument, to prove that it was written before the destruction of Jerusalem.* X. *Objections considered.* XI. *Observations upon this gospel.*

I. JOHN was the son of Zebedee a fisherman upon the sea of Galilee, probably [a] of the town of Bethsaida, and [b] Salome. John was the younger brother: for James is always [c] mentioned first, except in Luke ix. 28, and John is generally reckoned the youngest of all Christ's disciples.

Though Zebedee was by trade a fisherman, he needs not be reckoned poor: for, as St. Mark has particularly observed, he was not only master of a boat, and nets, but had "hired servants," ch. i. 20. Moreover, we may recollect what Peter said to Christ, who also had been a fisherman upon the same sea: "We have left all, and followed thee," Matt. xix. 27. They left their employments, by which they gained a subsistence: and for the present there was self-denial in their attendance upon Jesus.

It is not unlikely, that Zebedee died not long after these two brothers were called to be apostles. However, the circumstances of the family may be collected from what is said of their mother, who is mentioned, Matt. xxvii. 55, and Mark xv. 40, among "those women, who followed Jesus out of Galilee, and ministered unto him." That ministry is described, Luke viii. 3. To which might be added, that

[a] Zebedæum gente Galilæum fuisse, ex loco commorationis circa lacum Gennesareth, suspicamur. Incertius autem, Bethsaïdensem pronuntiare, ut plerique faciunt; cum id nitatur tantum testimonio evangelii, sociis Andreæ ac Petro hoc oppidum adsignantis. Neque tamen argumenta ad manus sunt, quibus vulgatam hanc opinionem impugnemus. Lampe, Prolegom. in Johan.

[b] Compare Matt. xxvii. 56, with Mark xv. 40, and xvi. 1.

[c] So Matt. iv. 21; ch. x. 2; Mark i. 19; ch. iii. 17; ch. x. 35; Luke v. 10; Acts i. 13.

she is mentioned among those women that bought sweet spices to embalm the body of Jesus, Mark xvi. 1; Luke xxiii. 55. And our Lord, having recommended his mother to this disciple, it is said, that "he took her to his own home." John xix. 27.

If Salome was related to our Lord in the manner supposed by [d] Theophylact, or some other way, with which we are not distinctly acquainted, that may have been, in part, the ground and reason of several things mentioned in the gospels, as the petition of these two brothers, disciples, for the first two places in Christ's kingdom: John's being the beloved disciple, and friend of Jesus, and being admitted to some freedoms denied to the rest: and, possibly,[e] performing some offices about his person: and, finally, our Lord's committing to him the care of his mother, so long as she should survive him.

In Acts iv. 13, it is said of Peter and John, that they were ignorant and unlearned men. Which, indeed, is nothing else, but that they were neither [f] doctors nor magistrates, but men of private stations, who had not been educated in the schools of the Rabbies: or, as Dr. Doddridge has happily translated this text, illiterate men, and in private stations of life. So Œcumenius says, that [g] St. John in sending a letter to Gaius had Paul for an example, who wrote to Timothy, and Titus, and to Philemon, an idiot: that is, a man of a private station: whereas Timothy and Titus had a public character in the church, as they were evangelists.

There can be no doubt, that Zebedee's sons, as the children of all pious Jews at that time, were well acquainted with the scriptures of the Old Testament. They had read them, and had heard them read and explained in the synagogues. They had also been accustomed to go to Jerusalem at the feasts, and had discoursed with many upon the

[d] See this Vol. p. 160.

[e] Opus scilicet erat ipsi aliquo, quem interdum ad matrem mitteret, (quod non ita raro factum esse, facile intelligitur,) quo uteretur ad lavandos sibi pedes, ad induendos sibi et exuendos calceos, [vid. Matt. iii. 11; Marc. i. 8; Luc. iii. 16; Joan. i. 27.] qui sibi præsto esset ad mandata subita, qui in cubiculo sibi adjaceret dormienti, qui alia sibi præstaret minuta officiola domestica, qui propterea perpetuus sibi esset pedissequus, nec nisi jussus ab ipso recederet. Heuman. Diss. Syll. tom. II. p. 338.

[f] Αγραμματοι, 'sine literis;' id est, non versati in doctrinis thalmudicis, quales illiterati Hebræis. Nam scripturas sacras apostoli et legerant, et memoriâ tenebant. Και ιδιωται. Idiotæ sunt Hebræis qui neque magistratus sunt, neque legisperiti. Grot. in loc.

[g] Προς δε Γαϊον ἑνα γραφων εχει Παυλον Τιτῳ γραφοντα και Τιμοθεῳ, και προς Φιλημονα δε ιδιωτην. Œcum. T. II. p. 606. C.

things of religion. They now were in expectation of the appearing of the Messiah, foretold in the law and the prophets: but, undoubtedly, were in the common prejudice of the nation, that it would be, in part at least, a worldly kingdom. And it is very likely, that they had heard John preach: though they did not attend statedly upon him as his disciples: for all the people of Judea, in general, went to John's baptism.

Says St. John, i. 35, 36, "Again, the next day after, John stood, and two of his disciples. And looking upon Jesus as he walked, he saith: Behold the Lamb of God"—From ver. 40, we learn, that one of these two, which heard John speak, was Andrew, Simon Peter's brother. And[h] some have supposed, that our evangelist, who writes this, was the other: which I do not look upon as certain, though I do not deny it.

Whether the other was John, or not, it ought to be reckoned unquestioned, that before he was called to be an apostle, he had seen and heard the Lord Jesus, and had been witness of some miracles wrought by him. It appears to me very probable, that[i] he was one of the disciples, who were present at the wedding in Cana of Galilee, where water was made wine. John ii. 1—11.

The call of James and John, to attend upon Jesus statedly, is related, Matt. iv. 21, 22; Mark i. 19, 20; Luke v. 1—10.

St. Mark, putting down the names of the twelve apostles, when he mentions James and John, says, that our Lord "surnamed them Boanerges, which is, sons of thunder," ch. iii. 17. By which it seems unreasonable to suppose that our Lord intended to reproach them with some fault in their natural temper, as if they were fierce and furious: though[k] a learned writer has intimated so much. That[l] name must have been very honourable, prophetically representing the resolution and courage with which they would openly and boldly declare the great truths of the gospel, when fully acquainted with them. How John answered this character, we know from what is said of him in the

[h] Duorum alter ver. 41. nominatur. Alter videtur ipse evangelista noster fuisse, uti visum in vitâ ejus. Lib. I. cap. 2. Lampe, in Joh. cap. i. ver. 35, 36.

[i] However, Basnage disputes this. Neque probabile admodum, Joannem his interfuisse nuptiis. Quod si concederetur, &c. Basn. ann. 30. num. xxxviii.

[k] 'However it was, our Lord, I doubt not, 'herein had respect to the furious and resolute disposition of those two bro-'thers, who seem to have been of a more fierce and fiery temper than the 'rest of the apostles.' Cave's Life of St. James the Great, num. 5. p. 142.

[l] Vid. Fr. Lamp. Prolegom. l. i. cap. 2. num. vii.—xv.

book of the Acts, and from his own writings, and from things recorded of him in ecclesiastical history. How well James, the other brother, answered that character, may be concluded from his being beheaded by Herod Agrippa at Jerusalem, not many years after our Lord's ascension. Which, we cannot doubt, was owing to an open and stedfast testimony to the resurrection of Jesus, and to other services for the church: whereby he had greatly signalized himself in the short period of his life after our Lord's ascension. Possibly [m] he had, with a freedom, not a little offensive, spoken of the calamities coming upon the Jewish people, if they did not repent, and believe in Jesus as the Christ: as also John the Baptist had declared in his preaching, Matt. iii. 7—12; Luke iii. 17; and Stephen in his, Acts vi. 13, 14. James [n] was the first martyr for Christ among the apostles; and bids fair for obtaining his petition, in a higher sense than it was first intended, of "sitting on the right hand or the left hand of Christ in his kingdom." And the other brother, surviving all the other apostles, bore the longest testimony to the truth of the gospel.

This account of that name is agreeable [o] to what Grotius

[m] Accedit altera ratio, quæ eos adhuc proprius spectabat, nempe quod in scopo ministerii sui præ cæteris apostolis Baptistæ similes futuri. Nempe sicut Baptista in eo totus erat, ut per tonitru præconii sui judicium jam tum Judæis imminens indicaret et averteret; ita et ministerium fratrum horum potissimum ad Judæos spectaturum erat. Jacobus quidem eâ fini post adscensionem Domini nunquam, quod scimus, ab Hierosolymâ discessit, donec pro fide martyrium subiret. Hoc vero ei evenisse, quam maxime probabile est, quia invidiosa præ cæteris ejus concio fuit, periculum instans incredulorum ex Judæis omni datâ occasione ingeminans, &c. Lamp. ib. l. i. cap. 2. num. xv.

[n] It has long been the general opinion of the people of Spain, that this James, the son of Zebedee, planted the gospel in that country. Gaspar Sanctius, a learned Spanish Jesuit, wrote a treatise in defence of it, beside what he says in his Commentary upon the Acts of the Apostles. But it is inconsistent with the history in the Acts: none of the apostles left Judea so soon; nor is this opinion founded on the testimony of any ancient writers of good credit; and it is now generally given up, even by Popish writers. Vid. Baron. A. D. 41. num. i. Tillemont, S. Jaques Le Majeur, et note vi. Mem. Ec. tom. I. I transcribe here the judgment of Estius. Deinde, quando occisus est, vixdum cœperat evangelium gentibus prædicari, ut ex præcedentibus et sequentibus patet. Nec dum apostoli dispersi erant in remotas gentes; sed ejus rei commodum tempus expectabant. Denique nullus scriptor antiquus certæ fidei refert, Jacobum Hispanias vidisse. Est. in Act. Ap. Cap. xii. ver. 2.—Vid. et Basnag. ann. 44. num. iv. v. et Dictionnaire de Moren, S. Jaques Le Majeur.

[o] Omnino mihi videtur Christus, in hujus nominis impositione, respexisse ad Aggæi vaticinium, cap. ii. 7.—quod de evangelii prædicatione exponit scriptor ad Hebræos, xii. 26. Ad hanc ergo maximam rerum mutationem significat Christus, Zebedæi filios eximios sibi ministros fore. Et certe destinatam illis excellentiam quandam inter ipsos apostolos vel hoc ostendit, quod cum Petro seorsim a cæteris multarum rerum testes sunt assumti. Adde jam

says in his Annotations. But Dr. Heuman[p] has another thought. He observes, that Simon, to whom Jesus gave the name of Peter, is often so called: but we do not read that the two sons of Zebedee were any where else spoken of by the name Boanerges, either by themselves or others. He thinks that the words should be thus rendered: 'And he 'had surnamed them Boanerges:' that is, upon a particular occasion he so called them. That occasion[q] he supposes to be the history related, Luke ix. 52—56. That is an ingenious conjecture. But if this name had been given them in the way of reproof and censure, as Christ once called Peter Satan, Matt. xvi. 23; Mark viii. 33, one would scarcely expect to see it here. The place, as seems to me, leads us to think the name honourable, as well as Peter. Which has been the general opinion of all times.

In Suicer's Thesaurus, at the word Βροντη, may be seen the observations of many ancient writers upon this name. I take Theophylact's only; who says, that[r] when Christ called these two disciples sons of thunder, he intimated that they would be great preachers and eminent divines.

From the time they were called by Christ, they statedly attended upon him. They heard his discourses, and saw his miracles.

They were two of the twelve, whom[s] Christ sent forth upon a commission, to preach in the land of Israel; which was of great use to them; thereby[t] they learned to trust in God, and were prepared for the greater difficulties of their apostleship afterwards.

John addressed himself to Christ, saying, "Master, we saw one casting out dæmons in thy name; and we forbade him, because he followeth not with us."—So in Luke ix. 49, 50. And more at large in Mark ix. 38—41. But it was a thing, in which several were concerned. For John says: "We saw one casting out dæmons in thy name; and we forbade him." The history, as recorded by the evan-

quod Jacobus primus apostolorum omnium sanguine suo Christi doctrinam obsignavit; et quod Johannes omnibus apostolis superstes diutissime testimonium perhibuit veritati. Grot. ad Marc. iii. 17.

[p] Nova Sylloge Dissert. part. I. p. 254—259.

[q] Legimus, et adversus Petrum, indigne se gerentem, in hæc verba erupisse Christum: Apage, Satana. Jam uti Satanas non factum est ordinarium Petri cognomen, sic nec Zebedæi fratres nisi semel nominati sunt Boanerges. Nec proinde laudis hoc nomen est, (quæ quidem inveterata est opinio,) sed nomen vitii. Non est, inquam, appellatio honorifica, sed invectiva. Ib. p. 259.

[r] Υιος δε βροντης ονομαζει τους τε Ζεβεδαιε, ὡς μεγαλοκηρυκας και θεολογικωτατους. In Marc. tom. I. p. 205. C.

[s] See Matt. x. 6; Mark vi. 7; Luke ix. 1.

[t] See Luke xxii. 35.

gelists, led me to think so: and Mr. Lampe[u] was of the same mind. Moreover, it might be done some while before.

Our Lord was going from Galilee to Jerusalem before the feast of tabernacles, as some think, or before the feast of the dedication, as[v] Dr. Doddridge argues. And, as he was to pass through the country of "Samaria, he sent messengers before his face: and they went, and entered into a village of the Samaritans, to make ready for him. But they did not receive him, because his face was as though he would go unto Jerusalem. When his disciples, James and John, saw this, they said: Lord, wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven, and consume them, even as Elias did. But he turned, and rebuked them, and said: Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of.—And they went to another village," Luke ix. 51—56. Some have been of opinion, that the messengers sent by our Lord, to prepare entertainment for him, were these two disciples. If so, this proposal might be suspected to proceed as much from resentment of an injurious treatment of themselves, as of their master. But to me that is not certain: I rather think, that those messengers were different persons. So[w] likewise argues Mr. Lampe.

The two brothers, James and John, were ambitious of high posts of honour and dignity in Christ's kingdom: which, with others, they esteemed to be of a worldly nature. The petition was presented by their mother, but at their instigation. And they seem to have been present at the same time: for our Lord's answer is directed to them, Matt. xx. 20—23; Mark x. 35—40.

The two brothers, James and John, and Peter, were the only disciples that were admitted to be present with our Lord at the raising of the daughter of Jairus, Mark v. 37; Luke viii. 51. The same three disciples were taken up by Christ into the mount, when he was transformed in a glorious manner, and Moses and Elias appeared talking with him, Matt. xvii. 1; Mark ix. 2; Luke ix. 28. The same three were admitted to be present at our Lord's devotions

[u] Ubi supr. l. i. cap. 2. num. 18.

[v] Family Expositor, Vol. II. p. 183.

[w] Cui tamen in eo non accedimus, quod filios Zebedæi ipsos illos legatos putat fuisse, quos Jesus in vicum Samaritanorum hospitium rogaturos miserat. Unde ob illatam sibi injuriam videntur exacerbati esse, sed textus legatos illos a filiis Zebedæi satis clare distinguit. Accedit, quod Jesus ad illos τραφεις, conversus, fuerit: quod indicat illos, cum Domino consilium proponerent, non fuisse Domino obvios, sed pone eum sequentes. Lampe, Proleg. l. i. cap. 2. n. xix. not. (b.)

in the garden, when he retired from the rest. But they all failed to watch with their Lord, as he had desired, Matt. xxvi. 36—45; Mark xiv. 32—42.

Says St. Mark, xiii. 1, 2, "And as he went out of the temple, one of his disciples saith unto him, Master, see what manner of stones, and what buildings are here. And Jesus answering, said unto him, Seest thou these great buildings? There shall not be left one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down." Compare Matt. xxiv. 1, 2. It follows in Mark xiii. 3, 4, "And as he sat on the mount of Olives, over against the temple, Peter, and James, and John, and Andrew, asked him privately: Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign, when all these things shall be fulfilled?" Whereby we perceive, that to those four disciples, especially, our Lord addressed himself, when he delivered the predictions concerning the great desolation coming upon the Jewish people, recorded in that chapter, and in Matt. xxiv; and Luke xxi.

This apostle and Peter were the two disciples whom Jesus sent to prepare for eating his last passover, Luke xxii. 8. Compare Matt. xxvi. 17—19; Mark xiv. 13—16.

Our Lord, sitting at supper with his disciples, said, "One of you will betray me." Peter beckoned to John, who leaned on the bosom of Jesus, "that he would ask, who it should be of whom he spake:" which he did. And our Lord gave him a sign, by which he might know whom he intended, John xiii. 21—26. This is an instance of the freedom which John might take, as the beloved disciple and friend of Jesus.

When our Lord was apprehended by the Jewish officers, we are informed by St. Mark, xiv. 51, 52, "And there followed him a certain young man, having a linen cloth cast about his naked body: and the young men laid hold of him. And he left the linen cloth, and fled from them." Some have thought that this young man was John. Cave[x] gives a good deal of countenance to that supposition. Others[y] have thought him to be James, the Lord's brother. But Grotius, and justly, wonders, that[z] any should have been of opinion that he was one of the apostles.

[x] 'Indeed upon our Lord's first apprehension, he fled after the other apostles; it not being without some probabilities of reason, that the ancients conceive him to have been that "young man," that followed after Christ, "having a linen cloth cast about his naked body;" whom when the officers laid hold upon, he left the linen cloth, and fled naked away.' Cave's Life of St. John, num. ii. p. 151.

[y] See Whitby upon Mark xiv. 51.

[z] Non de apostolorum grege, (quod miror, veteribus in mentem venire potuisse,) nec e domo, in quam Christus in urbe diverterat, sed ex villâ aliquâ

That Peter followed our Lord at a distance, and was admitted into the hall of the Jewish high priest, we are assured from all the gospels. It has been supposed by many, that John showed the like testimony of affection and respect for his Lord; for he says, ch. xviii 15. "And Simon Peter followed Jesus, and so did another disciple. That disciple was known to the high priest, and spake to her that kept the door, and brought in Peter."

Nevertheless it may be questioned, whether John hereby intends himself. Chrysostom [a] supposeth him to be meant, and that St. John concealeth his name out of humility and modesty. To the like purpose also [b] Theophylact. Nor had [c] Jerom any doubt here. But Augustine [d] was cautious in saying who it was; though he thought it might be John.

Let us now observe the sentiments of moderns. Whitby upon this place says: 'He seems not to be John: for he 'being a Galilean as well as Peter, they might equally have 'suspected him upon that account.' However, to this it might be answered, that John being known to the high priest, he was safe. But then another difficulty will arise; for it may be said, how came John to be so well known to the high priest, and his family, as to be able to direct the servant to admit a stranger, as Peter was, and at that time of night?

Grotius likewise thought that [e] this other disciple could not be John, or any one of the twelve, but rather some believer an inhabitant of Jerusalem, and, possibly, the

horto proximâ, strepitu militum excitatus, et subito accurrens, ut conspiceret quid agerent. Grot. ad Marc. xiv. 51.

[a] Τις εστιν ὁ αλλος μαθητης; Ὁ ταυτα γραψας. κ. λ. Chr. in. Joan. hom. 83. [al. 82.] T. VIII. p. 491. [b] Τις ην ὁ αλλος μαθητης; Αυτος οὐτος ὁ ταυτα γραψας· αποκρυπτει ἑαυτον δια ταπεινοφροσυνην. κ. λ. Theoph. in Joh. xviii. p. 809.

[c] Unde et Jesus Joannem evangelistam amabat plurimum, qui propter generis nobilitatem erat notus pontifici, et Judæorum insidias non timebat; in tantum ut Petrum introduceret in atrium, et staret solus apostolorum ante crucem, matremque Salvatoris in sua reciperet. Ad Princip. virg. ep. 96. [al. 16.] T. IV. p. 780. [d] Quisnam iste sit discipulus, non temere affirmandum est, quia tacetur. Solet autem se idem Joannes ita significare, et addere, quem diligebat Jesus. Fortassis ergo hic ipse est. Quisquis tamen sit, sequentia videamus. In Joann. Evang. Tr. 113. T. III. P. 2.

[e] Et sane non est probabile, aut ipsum Joannem hic intelligi (cur enim, Galilæus cum esset, minus interrogaretur ab adstantibus, quam Petrus?) aut aliquem ex duodecim, sed alium quendam Hierosolymitanum, non æque manifestum fautorem Jesu: quales multi erant in urbe, ut supra didicimus, xii. 42. Valde mihi se probat conjectura existimantium, hunc esse eum, in cujus domo Christus cœnaverat, ob id quod legitur, Matt. xxvi. 18. Grot. ad. Joh. xviii. 15.

person at whose house our Lord had eaten the paschal supper.

Lampe[f] hesitates: and at length allegeth the sentiment of a learned writer, who conjectured that this other disciple was Judas the traitor. For Judas, he thinks, was soon touched with remorse for what he had done: and he might follow Jesus to the high priest's, hoping, that by some means he might escape out of the hands of those to whom he had betrayed him. Judas, being there himself, might be very willing to let in Peter. Whether this conjecture be specious or not, I cannot say: but it does not seem to me very likely, that St. John should characterize Judas by the title of "another disciple," after he had betrayed his Lord and Master.

After all, I am not able to determine this point. At first reading this place of St. John, we are naturally enough led to think, that by "the other disciple" should be meant himself. But upon farther consideration there arise difficulties that may induce us to hesitate.

Whether he followed Jesus to the hall of Caiaphas, or not, we are assured that he attended the crucifixion, and seems to have been the only one of the twelve that did so. John xix. 25—27, "Now there stood by the cross of Jesus his mother.—When Jesus therefore saw his mother, and the disciple standing by whom he loved, he saith unto his mother, Woman, behold thy son. Then saith he to the disciple, Behold thy mother. And from that hour that disciple took her unto his own home." There might be several reasons for that determination: as John's being a relation, the sweetness of his temper, and his having somewhat of his own. He had been the beloved disciple or friend of Jesus; and therefore was the most proper to be thus trusted: and doubtless this designation was perfectly agreeable to our Lord's mother.

[f] Scripseram hæc, cum J. Casp. Merhenii Observat. Crit. in Pass. J. C. consulens, novam ab eo hypothesin proponi deprehenderem,—quæ notatu non indigna est. Ipsum siquidem Judam proditorem pro hoc discipulo habet quem Joannes nominatu post turpissimum proditionis crimen indignum censuit.—Id autem quod potissimum in rem spectare videtur, neque a nostrâ sententiâ, quam de consilio Judæ in prodendo Servatore fovemus, abludit, ita habet: 'Judam, post commissum scelus, pudore suffusum, pedetentim cohortem fuisse secutum, atque in Petrum ita incidisse, cui scelus suum excusare, quin negare potuit, se eâ mente Christo osculum dedisse, ut Christum proderet, sed ut periculum imminens ei subindicaret. Nos sane de eo vix dubitamus, Judam pœnitentiâ sceleris jam tum fuisse tactum, atque conscientiæ stimulis ea propter agitatum, facile potuisse eo consilio Jesum captum sequi, ut resciret, annon aliquâ ratione, pro solito, Jesus manus captorum evasurus esset. Liberam jam lectori optionem relinquimus.' Lampe, in Evang. Joann. cap. xviii. tom. III. p. 523. note (f.)

John saw his Lord expire on the cross; and still farther, "One of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, and forthwith came thereout blood and water. And he that saw it bare witness, and his record is true," ch. xix. 34, 35. And undoubtedly he also stayed afterwards, and saw the body of Jesus laid in the sepulchre, and the stone placed at the mouth of it; as related by himself, ch. xix. 38—42. Comp. Matt. xxvii. 53—60; Mark xv. 45—47; Luke xxiii. 50—56.

Early in the morning on which our Lord rose from the dead, Mary Magdalene and other women came to the sepulchre, and saw it was open, the stone having been taken away. Mary Magdalene knowing where she could find the two apostles Peter and John, went back to the city, and told them that "they had taken away the Lord out of the sepulchre: and," says she, "we know not where they have laid him. So they ran both together, to the sepulchre." And by what they saw there, they were led to the persuasion that Jesus was risen from the dead; as related, John xx. 1—10.

John was present with the other disciples when Jesus showed himself to them in the evening of the day on which he arose, and likewise eight days after, ch. xx. 19—29.

He has also particularly related the history of our Lord's showing himself to several disciples at the sea of Tiberias; when they had an extraordinary draught of fishes, in number one hundred and fifty-three. There were present at that time "Simon Peter, Thomas, Nathanael, the sons of Zebedee, and two other disciples," ch. xxi. 1—23. Beside other things which I omit, our Lord having had discourse with Peter, and having foretold his martyrdom, Peter put to him a question concerning John, saying, "Lord, what shall this man do? Jesus saith unto him: If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? Follow thou me. Then went this saying abroad among the brethren, that that disciple should not die. Yet Jesus said not unto him: He shall not die: but if I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?" Thus checking, as I apprehend, Peter's curiosity. However, it has been supposed by judicious commentators, that here is an intimation that John should not die before the destruction of Jerusalem. Nor is there any doubt but he survived that event, which few or none of the other apostles did. Though[g] our Lord's words may be

[g] Ita obscure significat, Johannem non, ut Petrum, morte violentâ moriturum, sed tali, quâ, sine hominum vi solveretur, ubi Christus tempus idoneum judicâsset. Quod et contigit, ut veterum plures consentiunt. Grot. ad Joan. xxi. 22.

understood to contain only an obscure intimation, that whereas Peter's days would be shortened by martyrdom, this disciple should be preserved till he died in the ordinary course of nature.

From all which we perceive, that[h] St. John was present at most of the things related by him in his gospel: and that he was an eye and ear-witness of our Lord's labours, journeyings, discourses, miracles, his low abasement even to an ignominious death, and his being alive again, and then ascending to heaven.

Having[i] been present with the rest of the apostles at the Lord's ascension, he[k] returned with them from mount Olivet to Jerusalem, and continued with them, joining with them in their devotions, and in the choice of another, to supply the place of Judas: and[l] partook in the plentiful effusion of the Holy Ghost upon the apostles and their company on the day of Pentecost next ensuing.

Peter and John, who often accompanied each other, healed the lame man at the temple, and upon that occasion preached to the people who assembled about them. For which they were brought before the Jewish council, and after some debates, were dismissed, with orders not to preach any more in the name of Jesus, Acts iii. and iv. 1—22.

Some while after this, the number of believers still increasing in Jerusalem, John and the rest of the apostles were apprehended and put into the common prison. But they were the same night delivered by an angel, who commanded them to "go and speak in the temple to the people;" which they did "early in the morning:" whereupon they were again taken up and brought before the council, who consulted how they might put them to death. But by the

[h] Ex ipsâ historiâ evangelicâ Joannis probabile fit, omnibus eventibus, itineribus, miraculis, concionibus Servatoris nostri ipsum interfuisse—cum probabile sit, illum fuisse inter discipulos duos Joannis Baptistæ, a quibus collectionis discipulorum initium Jesus fecit, uti L. i. cap. 2. sect. ii. ostendimus, inde colligimus, evangelistam nostrum statim ab initio rebus, quas scribit, interfuisse, et hanc esse veram rationem, cur non altius filum historiæ suæ incipere ret. Ex omnibus quoque sequentibus narrationibus nulla est, in quâ absentem evangelistam nostrum statuamus fuisse, nisi forte excipere velis illa, quæ in palatio Annæ et Caïaphæ acciderunt. Cap. xvii. 13—17. De quibus tamen res est dubia, quia definiri accurate nequit, annon discipulus, qui Petrum in palatium Caïaphæ introduxerit, ipse evangelista noster fuerit. Sed licet ille præsens non perceperit, a Petro tamen, socio intimo, statim proculdubio audivit. Et forte per ejus relationem excitatus est, ut ad prætorium Pilati summo mane advolaret, atque ita cum reliquis mulieribus Jesum ad crucem sequeretur.—Ex quo patet, quantâ cum emphasi præ cæteris apostolis et evangelistis dicere potuit: Quæ audivimus, quæ vidimus, 1 Jo. i. 1, 2. Lamp. Proleg. l. 2. cap. 4. num. vi.

[i] Mark xvi. 19; Luke xxiv. 50—53; Acts i. 1—12.

[k] Acts i. 12—26.

[l] Acts ii. 1—13.

advice of Gamaliel that design was laid aside. "And when they had beaten them, they commanded that they should not speak in the name of Jesus, and let them go. Whereupon the apostles departed from the presence of the council, rejoicing.—And daily in the temple, and from house to house, they ceased not to teach and preach Jesus Christ."

Afterward, there being a violent persecution at Jerusalem, many were scattered abroad. Philip, one of the seven, went down to Samaria, and preached to them, and wrought many miracles, insomuch that great numbers believed. When the apostles, who were at Jerusalem, heard of this, they sent unto them Peter and John, that they might receive the Holy Ghost. Having performed that service, they returned to Jerusalem: and in their way preached the gospel in many villages of the Samaritans, Acts viii. 5—25.

From what St. Paul says in the second chapter of the epistle to the Galatians we perceive, that John was present at the council of Jerusalem: of which an account is given, Acts xv. Which council was held in the year 49, or 50, or thereabout. And it may be reckoned probable, that till that time John had stayed in the land of Israel, and had not been abroad in any Gentile countries.

I would add, that though no miracles are related to be done by St. John beside those which have been here taken notice of, I reckon it very probable, that many miracles, beside those particularly mentioned by the historian, were wrought by him and other apostles during their stay in Judea. This may be inferred from general expressions of St. Luke in several places. "And many signs and wonders were done by the apostles," Acts ii. 43. "And with great power gave the apostles witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus," ch. iv. 33. "And by the hands of the apostles were many signs and wonders wrought among the people," ch. v. 12. Comp. iv. 29, 30.

From the book of the Revelation, ch. i. 9, we learn, that St. John was for a while in the island called Patmos; where he was favoured with visions and revelations.

Thus far we have endeavoured to collect the history of this apostle from the New Testament.

II. From ecclesiastical history we learn, that St. John lived to a great age, and that in the latter part of his life he resided in Asia, particularly at Ephesus, the chief city of that country.

Concerning his abode in Asia we have divers testimonies of good credit. Irenæus in[m] two places of his work

[m] Iren. adv. Hær. l. 2. cap. 22. n. v. p. 148. ed Mass. et l. 3. cap. 3. p. 178.

against heresies, both [n] cited by Eusebius, says, that John the apostle lived in Asia till the time of Trajan [who succeeded Nerva in the year of Christ 98]. Eusebius [o] understands Clement of Alexandria to speak to the like purpose. Origen also says, that [p] John, having lived long in Asia, died at Ephesus. Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, about 196, is an unexceptionable witness, that [q] John was buried in that city. Jerom [r] in his book of Illustrious Men, and in his books against Jovinian, says, 'That the apostle John lived 'in Asia, to the time of Trajan; and dying at a great age, 'in the sixty-eighth year of our Lord's passion, was buried 'near the city of Ephesus.' Supposing our Lord to have been crucified in the year 32, of the vulgar æra, which [s] seems to have been Jerom's opinion, sixty-eight years will reach to the year 100, or the third of Trajan: at which year of that emperor the death of St. John is placed by Jerom in his [t] Chronicle.

What was John's age when called by Christ we are not informed. Baronius [u] thought he might then be about 22 years of age. Having been with Christ three years, he was about 25 years of age when our Lord was crucified. Tillemont [v] supposes St. John to have been about 25 or 26 years of age when called to be an apostle. Lampe [w] thinks, that he was about the same age with our Saviour. For my part, I cannot persuade myself that any of Christ's apostles, when called to attend upon him, that they might be his witnesses to the world, were much under the age of thirty. If it hence follows, that John was a hundred years of age, or thereabout, when he died, it is not at all incredible nor unlikely.

III. As it is an allowed point, that John dwelt in Asia in the latter part of his life; we may be reasonably desirous to know when he settled in that country; and for determining this, the books of the New Testament may afford good hints. For [x] in all St. Luke's history of the preaching and travels of Paul, particularly in Asia, no mention is made of John:

[n] Euseb. H. E. l. 3. cap. 23. in.
[o] Vid. Euseb. Ibid.
[p] Ap. Euseb. l. 3. cap. 1.
[q] Ap. Euseb. l. v. cap. 24. in.
[r] Vol. iv. ch. cxiv. num. viii. 4.
[s] Vid Basnag. ann. 101. num. ii.
[t] P. 165. ex ed. Scalig.
[u] Ann. 101. num. ix.
[v] S. Jean l' evangeliste, art. x. et note xv. Mem. tom. I.
[w] Quare nihil impedit, quo minus ejusdem ferme ætatis cum Servatore nostro fuerit. Prolegom. in Jo. l. i. cap. 2. num. i. note [a].
[x] 'In the division of provinces, which the apostles made among themselves, Asia fell to his share, though he did not presently enter into his 'charge. Otherwise, we must have heard of him in the account which St. 'Luke gives of St. Paul's several journeys into, and residence in, those parts.' Cave's Life of St. John, sect. iv.

which may induce us to think, that he was not there at that time. Nor are there any salutations sent to John in any of St. Paul's epistles written at Rome: several of which were sent to Ephesus, or other places not very remote from it: as the epistle to the Ephesians, the second epistle to Timothy, probably, at Ephesus, the epistle to the Colossians, and the epistle to Philemon, at Colosse.

I will now observe the opinions of some learned moderns. Baronius thought, that [y] this apostle did not come to reside in Asia, until after the death of St. Peter and St. Paul. Du Pin says: 'We [z] do not exactly know when he 'came into Asia: perhaps it was about the year 70.' Tillemont was of opinion, that [a] St. John did not come to reside in Asia, till about the year 66. But he supposeth, that upon some occasion, he had before that been in that country, without making a stay there: which last, as I apprehend, is said without any good authority. Mr. Lampe was of opinion, that [b] John did not leave Judea, till after the death of James, called the Less, and but a short time only before the destruction of Jerusalem.

To me it seems not unlikely, that St. John came into Asia about the time that the war broke out in Judea, in the year 66, or a short time before, when, probably, St. Peter and Paul had been before crowned with martyrdom.

As St. John stayed a good while in Palestine, it may be reasonably concluded, that the Virgin Mary did not go with him to Ephesus, as [c] Baronius and some others have thought, but died before he went thither: which was the opinion of [d] Cave, and [e] Basnage.

IV. St. John having had a long life, many things have been said of him, some true, others false. Most of them have been already taken notice of in several chapters of this work: it may not be improper to recollect them here, with some remarks.

I. Apollonius, who wrote against the Montanists, and flourished about the year 211, says, in a fragment preserved by Eusebius, 'That [f] by the divine power John raised up a

[y] A. D. 97. num. ii.

[z] Du Pin, Diss. Prel. 1. 2. ch. 2. sect. vi.

[a] St. Jean, art. iv.

[b] Post ejus (Jacobi Minoris) excessum neminem ex *των δωδεκα* grege et constantius et diutius Hierosolymis substitisse nostro apostolo; ita ut vix exiguo ante exordium intervallo, inde se avelli pateretur. Proleg. l. i. cap. 2. n. xv. p. 29.

[c] A. D. 44. n. xxix.

[d] 'Probable therefore it is, that he 'dwelt in his own house at Jerusalem, at least till the death of the blessed 'Virgin.' Cave's Life of St. John, sect. iv.

[e] Vid. Basnag. ann. 46. num. xxxviii.

[f] See Vol. ii. p. 393.

dead man to life at Ephesus.' Which miracle is also taken notice of by [g] Sozomen, and [h] Nicephorus, and may have been really done. But if we had had a more circumstantial history of it, and if it had been mentioned by some other early writers, beside Apollonius, it would have been more credible.

2. There was a book forged with the title of the Travels of Paul and Thecla by a presbyter, who was deposed for so doing, as related by Tertullian. Jerom says that he was a presbyter in Asia, and that he was convicted before St. John of being the author of it, and for that reason was deposed. Of this matter we have already spoken distinctly, and therefore refer to what was then said.[i]

3. It is also related of our apostle, that going to bathe at Ephesus, and perceiving that Cerinthus, or, as others say, Ebion, was already in the bath, he came out again hastily, and would not make use of the bath. The probability of which account was examined formerly.[k]

4. It is said that, by order of the emperor Domitian, St. John was cast into a caldron of boiling oil at Rome, and came out again without being hurt. The[l] truth of which story likewise has been considered by us.

5. Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus in the latter part of the second century, says, that John was Christ's high priest, wearing on his forehead a golden plate: which account[m] has been considered, and the judgments of divers learned men upon it alleged.

6. Eusebius has a story, from a work of Clement of Alexandria, of a young man in a city of Asia, not far from Ephesus, who, after having been instructed in the christian religion, took to evil courses, and became profligate: but nevertheless was afterwards brought to repentance by our apostle. This account is inserted at large by Eusebius[n] in his Ecclesiastical History. It has been repeated in like manner by Simeon Metaphrastes in his Life of St. John. Chrysostom[o] has referred to it. It is also briefly told in the[p] Paschal Chronicle. I have already taken some notice of this[q] story. S. Basnage[r] thinks it to be a fable, or

[g] Soz. l. 7. cap. 27. p. 750.
[h] Niceph. l. 4. cap. 25.
[i] See Vol. ii. p. 304, 305, 332.
[k] See Vol. ii. p. 95, note [c].
[l] See Vol. ii. p. 287, note [l].
[m] See Vol. iv. p. 448, 449.
[n] L. 3. cap. 23.
[o] Ad Theodor. Laps. T. I. p. 31. ed. Bened.
[p] Chr. Pasch. p. 251. D.
[q] See Vol. iv. as note [m].
[r] Apologo quam historia videtur esse propior—Ac sane nescimus, si vera historia est, cur Clemens μυθω, fabulæ, nomen ipsi primum imposuerit. Fabula fuit ratione rei significantis, veritasque respectu rei significatæ, quæ mentibus

feigned apologue, composed to convey useful instruction. Mr. Lampe[s] is favourable to this history. And, perhaps, it may be true, abating some circumstances: which are not seldom added to such accounts, to render them the more entertaining.

7. Jerom has given an account of St. John's method of preaching, when he was of a great age, and was not able to make a long discourse. This[t] was taken notice of by us in a proper place: nor is the truth of it, though related by Jerom only, disputed, either by[u] Lampe, or[v] Le Clerc.

8. It is generally supposed, that[w] John is one of those apostles who lived a single life: it is said by[x] Tertullian and Jerom; which last affirms, that[y] ecclesiastical history assures us of it; and he makes it the ground of all the peculiar privileges of this apostle.

9. Another thing said of John, is, that he was banished into Patmos, an island of the Mediterranean sea, not far from the coast of Asia. And if he is the writer of the book of the Revelation, which we do not now dispute, the thing is unquestioned. But I have deferred the consideration of this particular till now, because learned moderns are not agreed about the time of it.

V. I shall therefore first put down the accounts of ancient authors, and then observe the opinions of learned men of later times.

Irenæus says of the Revelation, 'that[z] it was seen no

proponebatur, nempe eximii pastoris officium, ac vis pœnitentiæ. Non insolens erat antiquis, uti apologis ejusmodi ad informandos mores.—Si cui tamen placet de Joanne Clementis narrationem veram historiam esse, quia sic Veteribus visum, de hac re quidem contendere nolumus. Basn. ann. 97. num. x.

[s] Prolegom. l. i. cap. v. num. iii.—ix.

[t] Vol. iv. p. 447.

[u] Licet enim Hieronymus solus hujus narrationis auctor sit, nihil tamen occurrit, quod non cum more Joannis, ut cum ratione ecclesiæ ejus temporis, apprime convenit. Lamp. Proleg. l. i. cap. v. n. xi.

[v] H. E. ann. 99. num. i.

[w] Vid. Lamp. Proleg. l. i. cap. i. num. xiii.

[x] Joannes Christi spado. De Monog. cap. 17. p. 688.

[y] Talem fuisse eunuchum, quem Jesus amavit plurimum, evangelistam Joannem, ecclesiasticæ tradunt historiæ: qui recubuit super pectus Jesu: qui, Petro tardius ambulante, elatus virginitatis alis cucurrit ad Dominum; qui in secreta divinæ se nativitatis immergens, ausus est dicere: In principio erat Verbum, &c. In Is. cap. LVI. tom. III. p. 410.

Joannes vero noster, quasi aquila, ad superna volat, et ad ipsum Patrem pervenit, dicens: In principio erat Verbum, &c. Exposuit virginitas, quod nuptiæ scire non poterant. Et, ut brevi sermone multa comprehendam, doceamque, cujus privilegii sit Joannes, imo in Joanne virginitas, a Domino virgine, mater virgo virgini discipulo commendatur. Adv. Jovin. l. i. T. IV. P. II. p. 169. Vid. et ad. Princip. Virg. ep. 96. [al. 16.] ib. p. 780. f.

[z] See Vol. ii. p. 181.

'long time ago, but almost in our age, at the end of the 'reign of Domitian.' And though Irenæus does not say that St. John was then in Patmos, yet since he supposeth him to be the person who had the revelation, he must have believed him to be then in Patmos, as the book itself says, ch. i. 9.

Clement of Alexandria, in his book, entitled, Who is the rich Man that may be saved, as cited by Eusebius, speaks[a] of 'John's returning from Patmos to Ephesus, after the 'death of the tyrant:' by whom, it is probable, he means Domitian.

Tertullian, in his Apology, speaks of Domitian as[b] having banished some christians, and afterwards giving them leave to return home: probably intending St. John, and some others. In another work he says, 'that[c] John having 'been sent for to Rome, was cast into a vessel of boiling 'oil, and then banished into an island;' in the time of Domitian, as is most probable.

Origen, explaining Matt. xx. 23, says: 'James,[d] the 'brother of John, was killed with a sword by Herod. And 'a Roman emperor, as tradition teaches, banished John into 'the island Patmos for the testimony which he bore to the 'word of truth. And John himself bears witness to his 'banishment, omitting the name of the emperor by whom 'he was banished, saying in the Revelation: "I John, who 'also am your brother and companion in tribulation, and 'in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ, was in the 'isle of Patmos, for the word of God and for the testimony 'of Jesus Christ." And[e] it seems, that the Revelation 'was seen in that island.'

Victorinus, bishop of Pettaw about 290, again and again says, that[f] John was banished by Domitian, and in his reign saw the Revelation.

Eusebius, giving an account of Domitian's persecution, says: 'In[g] this persecution, as it is said, John, the 'apostle and evangelist, being still living, was banished 'into the island Patmos for the testimony of the word of 'God.'

[a] Επειδη γαρ τε τυραννε τελευτησαντος, απο της Πατμε της νησε μετηλθεν εις την Εφεσον. κ. λ. Ap. Euseb. H. E. l. 3. c. 23. p. 92.

[b] Tentaverat et Domitianus, portio Neronis de crudelitate. Sed, qua et homo, facile cœptum repressit, restitutis etiam quos relegaverat. Apol. cap. 5.

[c] —habes Romam—ubi apostolus Joannes, posteaquam in oleum igneum demersus, nihil passus est, in insulam relegatur. De Pr. Hær. cap. 36. p. 245.

[d] Comm. in Matt. T. I. p. 417. Huet.

[e] Και εοικε την αποκαλυψιν εν τη νησῳ τεθεωρηκεναι. Ibid. C.

[f] See Vol. iii. p. 179.

[g] H. E. l. 3. cap. 18.

Epiphanius, as formerly[h] shown, says: 'John prophe-
'sied in the isle of Patmos, in the reign of Claudius.' And in another place, then only referred to, he says: 'John
'wrote his gospel in his old age, when he was more than
'ninety years old, after his return from Patmos, which[i] was
'in the time of Claudius Cæsar.'

Jerom, in his book of Illustrious Men, as[k] formerly cited, says: 'Domitian in the fourteenth year of his reign raising
'the second persecution after Nero, John was banished
'into the island Patmos, where he wrote the Revelation.'
And in another work, also cited[l] formerly, he says again;
'John was a prophet, as he saw the Revelation in the island
'Patmos, where he was banished by Domitian.' And I shall now transcribe below[m] in his own words, without translating them, his comment upon Matt. xx. 23, where he speaks of St. John's having been banished into Patmos: but does not name the emperor, by whom he was banished.

Sulpicius Severus says, 'that[n] John, the apostle and
'evangelist, was banished by Domitian into the island Pat-
'mos: where he had visions, and where he wrote the book
'of the Revelation.'

Arethas in his commentary upon the Revelation, supposed to be written in the sixth century, says, upon the authority of Eusebius, that[o] John was banished into Patmos by Domitian.

Isidore, of Seville, near the end of the sixth century, says, 'Domitian[p] raised a persecution against the christians.
'In his time the apostle John having been banished into the
'island Patmos saw the Revelation.'

We may now make a remark or two.

1. All these testimonies are of use, whether they name the island where John was banished, or the emperor by whom

[h] Vol. iv. p. 190.

[i] *Την επι Κλαυδιε γενομενην Καισαρος.* Hær. 51. num. xii.

[k] See Vol. iv. p. 446. [l] P. 446, 447.

[m] Quæritur, quomodo calicem martyrii filii Zebedæi, Jacobus videlicet et Joannes, biberint; quum scriptura narret Jacobum tantum apostolum ab Herode capite truncatum, Joannes autem propriâ morte vitam finierit. Sed, si legamus ecclesiasticas historias, in quibus fertur, quod et ipse propter martyrium sit missus in ferventis olei dolium, et inde ad suscipiendam coronam Christi athleta processerit, statimque relegatus in Paumon insulam sit, videbimus, martyrio animum non defuisse, et bibisse Joannem calicem confessionis. Comm. in Matt. tom. IV. P. I. p. 92.

[n] See Vol. iv. ch. cxx.

[o] *Εξορισον δε αυτον γενεσθαι εν Πατμῳ τῃ νησῳ ὑπο Δομετιανε, Ευσεβιος ὁ Παμφιλε εν τῳ χρονικῳ αυτε βιβλιῳ παρατιθεται.* Andr. in Apoc. ap. Œcum. tom. II. p. 654. D.

[p] This Vol. p. 140.

he was banished, or not. They all agree that St. John was sent thither by way of punishment, or restraint, for bearing witness to the truth: which confutes the opinion of Lightfoot, 'that[q] John travelling in the ministry of the gospel, 'up and down, from Asia westward, comes into the isle 'Patmos, in the Icarian sea, an island about thirty miles 'compass: and there on the Lord's day he has these visions, 'and an angel interprets to him all he saw.'

2. All these writers, who mention the time of the Revelation, and of the banishment, say, it was in the time of Domitian, and that he was the emperor by whom St. John was banished: except Epiphanius, who says it was in the time of Claudius. As he is singular, it should seem that he cannot be of any great weight against so many others.

Nevertheless, as some learned men, particularly Grotius, have paid great regard to Epiphanius in this point, it is fit we should consider what they say.

Says Grotius in a tract, entitled, A Comment upon divers Texts of the New Testament, relating to Antichrist: particularly upon the tenth verse of the seventeenth chapter of the Revelation: 'John[r] began to be illuminated with divine 'visions in the island Patmos, in the time of Claudius; 'which was the opinion of the most ancient christians. See 'Epiphanius in the heresy of the Alogians. Claudius, as 'we learn from Acts xviii. 2, "commanded all Jews to de-'part from Rome." Under the name of Jews, christians 'also were comprehended, as has been observed by many 'learned men. And it cannot be doubted, but many 'governors of the Roman provinces followed that example. 'So therefore John was driven from Ephesus.'

That argument was long ago examined by[s] David Blondel, who says, 1. It is not true, that the most ancient writers said that St. John was sent into Patmos by Claudius. It is Epiphanius only who says so: he is altogether singular. There are no ancients, either before or after him, who have said this. 2. As Epiphanius is singular, he ought not to be regarded. 3. There was no persecution of the christians in

[q] Harmony of the N. T. Vol. I. p. 341.

[r] Cœpit autem Joannes in Patmo esse, et Dei visis illuminari Claudii temporibus; quæ vetustissimorum christianorum est sententia, non Domitiani, ut volunt alii. Vide Epiphanium in Hæresi Alogorum. Claudius Judæos, sub quorum nomine tunc et christiani censebantur, ut multis viris doctis observatum est, Româ pepulerat, Act. xviii. 2. Quod exemplum non dubium est quin imitati sint multi præsides Romanarum provinciarum. Ita Epheso expulsus Joannes. Grot. Commentatio ad loca quædam N. T. quæ de Antichristo agunt, aut agere putantur. Opp. tom. III.

[s] Des Sibylles, l. 2. ch. iii. p. 145—148, à Charenton. 1649.

the reign of Claudius. There is no proof from any ancient monuments, that christians, as such, suffered banishment under that emperor. It is allowed that[t] Nero was the first Roman emperor who persecuted the christians. 4. The edict of Claudius only banished the Jews from Rome. It did not affect the Jews in the provinces, as appears from the New Testament itself, particularly Acts xviii. and xix. It is manifest from the history in the Acts, that in the reign of Claudius, in other parts of the empire out of Rome, the Jews enjoyed as full liberty as they did before. Paul and Silas, Aquila and Priscilla, dwelt quietly at Corinth; where the men of their nation had their synagogue, and assembled in it according to custom without molestation. 5. Nor could the governors of provinces banish either Jews or christians out of their governments, without order from the emperor: and that they had no such order, is apparent. Neither Jews nor christians were molested by them at Ephesus, as may be perceived from the history in the nineteenth chapter of the Acts. That they were not molested by them at Corinth, appears from the preceding chapter. 6. St. John could not be banished from Ephesus by Claudius, or the governors under him: for he was not in that city during the reign of that emperor, nor in the former part of the reign of Nero, as has been shown. He did not come thither till near the end of the reign of the last-mentioned emperor: therefore he could not be sooner banished from Ephesus.

These observations, if I am not mistaken, are sufficient to confute the opinion of Grotius.

Sir Isaac Newton was of opinion, that[u] St. John was

[t] Consulite commentarios vestros. Illic reperietis, primum Neronem in hanc sectam, cum maxime Romæ orientem, Cæsariano gladio ferocîsse. Sed tali dedicatore damnationis nostræ etiam gloriamur. Tertull. Ap. cap. vi.

Nerone imperante—qui dignus exstitit, qui persecutionem in christianos primus inciperet. Sulp. Sev. Hist. Sacr. l. 2. cap. 39.

Nam primus Romæ christianos suppliciis et mortibus affecit. P. Oros. l. 7. cap. 7. Vid. et Euseb. H. C. l. 2. cap. 25. p. 67.

[u] Sir Isaac Newton's opinion is much the same with that of John Hentenius of Mechlin, confuted by David Blondel in the same work, and in the next chapter to that in which he confuted Grotius. Hentenius and Newton argue much alike. It may be suspected, that Newton incautiously borrowed some of his weak arguments. Says Blondel: 'Jean Hentenius en sa préface sur le Commentaire d' Aréthas—a le discours qui suit: 'Il me semble que Jean—a 'été relégué par Néron en Patmos au même temps que celui là a tué dans 'Rome—Pierre et Paul. Tertullien, voisin des temps des mêmes Apôtres, as- 'sure cela même en deux lieux. Eusèbe aussi traite la même chose au livre de 'la Démonstration Evangélique, combien qu'en ses Chroniques, et en l'His- 'toire Ecclésiastique il dit que cela est arrivé sous Domitien: ce que aussi 'Saint Hiérome et plusieurs autres suivent. Mais à ces livres ci, comme écrit, 'les années précédentes, si grande autorité n' est pas attribuée, qu' à celui de la

banished into Patmos, and that the Revelation was seen in the reign of Nero, before the destruction of Jerusalem.

'Eusebius,' says he,[v] 'in his Chronicle and Ecclesiastical History follows Irenæus: (who said the Apocalypse 'was written in the time of Domitian:) but afterwards in his 'Evangelical Demonstration he conjoins the banishment of 'John into Patmos, with the deaths of Peter and Paul.'

To which I answer, first, that[w] the Ecclesiastical History was not written before the Evangelical Demonstration, but after it: for the Demonstration is referred to at the end of the second chapter of the first book of the Ecclesiastical History. Secondly, Eusebius in his Demonstration is not different from himself in his Ecclesiastical History. In his Demonstration, having spoken of the imprisonment of all the apostles at Jerusalem, and of their being beaten, and of the stoning of Stephen, the beheading of James the son of Zebedee, and the imprisonment of Peter, he adds: 'James,[x] 'the Lord's brother, was stoned, Peter was crucified at Rome 'with his head downward, and Paul was beheaded, and 'John banished into an island.' But he does not say, that all these things happened in the time of one and the same emperor. It is plain, that it is not his design to mention exactly the time of the sufferings of all these persons. Nothing hinders our supposing, that the apostles Peter and Paul were put to death by order of Nero, and John banished by Domitian, many years afterwards, agreeably to what himself writes in his Chronicle and History.

It follows in Sir Isaac Newton. 'And[y] so do Tertullian, 'and Pseudo-Prochorus, as well as the first author, whoever 'he was, of that very ancient fable, that St. John was put 'by Nero into a vessel of hot oil.'

I place below[z] the words of Tertullian, to which Sir Isaac refers. And I answer: it is true, that Tertullian speaks of the death of Peter and Paul, and of John's being cast into boiling oil, and then banished, all together: but he does not say, that all happened in the same reign. St. John's banish-

'Démonstration Evangélique, vu qu'il a éte depuis, et plus correctement éla-'bouré.' Blondel des Sibylles. l. 2. ch. iv. p. 148, 149.

[v] Newton's Observations upon the Apocalypse of St. John, chap. i. p. 236.

[w] See in this work, Vol. iv. p. 75. Vales. Annot. in Euseb. p. 8, 9. Fabric. Bib. Gr. l. 5. cap. iv. tom. VI. p. 57—59.

[x] —*και Πετρος δε επι Ρωμης κατα κεφαλης σαυρεται, Παυλος τε αποτεμνεται, Ιωαννης τε νησῳ παραδιδοται.* Dem. Ev. l. 3. p. 116.

[y] As before, p. 236.

[z] Ista quam felix ecclesia, ubi Petrus passioni Dominicæ adæquatur; ubi Paulus Joannis exitu coronatur; ubi apostolus Joannes, posteaquam in oleum igneum demersus, nihil passus est, in insulam relegatur! De Præsc. cap. 36. p. 245.

ment is the last thing mentioned by him: and, probably, it happened not till after the death of Peter and Paul. It is likely, that Tertullian supposed it to have been done by the order of Domitian; for in another place he speaks of the persecution of that emperor, as[a] consisting chiefly in banishments.

'— and Pseudo-Prochorus.' What place of Prochorus, who pretended to be one of the seven deacons, and is called by Baronius[b] himself a great liar, Sir Isaac Newton refers to, I do not know. But in his history of St. John he is entirely against him. For[c] he particularly relates the sufferings, which St. John underwent in the second persecution of the christians, which was raised by Domitian. That emperor sent orders to the proconsul at Ephesus, to apprehend the apostle. When the proconsul had got St. John in his power, he informed Domitian of it; who then commanded the proconsul to bring him to Rome. When[d] he was come, the emperor would not see him, but ordered him to be cast into a vessel of scalding oil, and he came out unhurt. Then Domitian commanded the proconsul to have St. John back again to Ephesus. Some time[e] after that, by order of the same Domitian, John, and others at Ephesus, were banished into Patmos. Domitian[f] being dead, they returned to Ephesus with the leave of his successor, who did not persecute the christians. So Pseudo-Prochorus.

Since the great Newton has been pleased to refer to such a writer, I shall take notice of another of the like sort; I mean Abdias, who assumed the character of the first bishop of Babylon. What he says is to this purpose: that[g] John,

[a] Tentaverat et Domitianus—sed, quâ et homo, facile cœptum repressit, restitutis etiam quos relegaverat. Apol. cap. 5.

[b] — in multis mendacissimus hic auctor fuisse convincitur. An. 92. num. i.

[c] Secundam vero persecutionem Domitianus excitârat, cujus temporibus Joannes Ephesi morabatur. Imperator autem Domitianus epistolam misit Ephesum ad proconsulem civitatis—Proch. de Vit. Joan. cap. 8. Ap. Bib. Patr. Lugd. T. II.

[d] Audiens autem Domitianus de adventu ejus, noluit impius Cæsar videre faciem apostoli. Et jussit, ut proconsul duceret ad Portam Latinam, et in ferventis olei dolium illum vivum dimitti, &c. Ibid. cap. 10.

[e] Ibid. cap. 14.

[f] Mortuo autem Domitiano, qui nos transmiserat in exilium, successor ejus non prohibebat christianos. Et cum audîsset de bonitate et sanctimoniâ Joannis, quodque fuisset injuste a prædecessore suo exilio relegatus, per literas nos revocavit ab exilio. Ib. cap. 45.

[g] Est igitur et hoc ipsum amoris Salvatoris in beatum Joannem indicium non vulgare, quod vitâ reliquos omnes superaverit, et, ut dictum est, ad Domitiani imperatoris ætatem usque in Asiâ verbum salutis populis adnuntiârit—Cui proconsul loci cum edictum imperatoris, ut Christum negaret, et a prædicatione cessaret, legisset, apostolus intrepide respondit.—Ad cujus responsionem motus

who survived the other apostles, lived to the time of Domitian, preaching the word to the people in Asia. When Domitian's edict for persecuting the christians was brought to Ephesus, and John refused to deny Christ, or to give over preaching, the proconsul ordered that he should be drowned in a vessel of boiling oil: but John presently leaped out unhurt. The proconsul would then have set him at liberty, if he had not feared to transgress the emperor's edict. He therefore banished John into Patmos, where he saw and wrote the Revelation. After the death of Domitian, his edicts having been abrogated by the senate, they who had been banished, returned to their homes: and John came to Ephesus, where he had a dwelling, and many friends.

Then follows an account of St. John's visiting the churches in the neighbourhood of Ephesus. Where is inserted also the story, formerly taken notice of, concerning the young man, as related by Eusebius from Clement of Alexandria: and as happening, not after the death of Nero, but of Domitian.

Newton proceeds: 'as well as the first author, whoever 'he was, of that very ancient fable, that John was put by 'Nero into a vessel of hot oil, and coming out unhurt, was 'banished by him into Patmos. Though this story be no 'more than a fiction, yet it was founded on a tradition of the 'first churches, that John was banished into Patmos in the 'days of Nero.'

Who was the first author of that fable, I do not know. But it does not appear, that Tertullian, the first writer who has mentioned it, thought it to be in the time of Nero. He might mean, and probably did mean, Domitian, the same who banished John into an island: as did also the two writers just taken notice of, Prochorus and Abdias, to whom we were led by Sir Isaac. Jerom, who[h] in his books against Jovinian, mentions this story, as from Tertullian,

proconsul jussit eum velut rebellem in dolio ferventis olei demergi; qui statim ut conjectus in æneo est, veluti athleta unctus, non adustus, de vase exiit. Ad quod miraculum proconsul stupefactus, voluit eum libertati suæ reddere. Et fecisset, nisi timuisset edictum Cæsaris. Mitiorem igitur pœnam cogitans, in exilium eum relegavit, in insulam, quæ dicitur Patmos; in quâ et Apocalypsin, quæ ex nomine ejus legitur, et vidit, et scripsit. Post mortem autem Domitiani, quia omnia ejus decreta Senatus infringi jusserat, inter cæteros, qui ab eo relegati fuerant, et ad propria remeabant, etiam sanctus Joannes Ephesum rediit, ubi et hospitiolum, et multos amicos, habebat. Abd. Hist. Apostol. cap. v. ap. Fabr. Cod. Apocr. N. T. p. 533—536.

[h] Vidit enim in Patmo insulâ, in quâ fuerat a Domitiano principe relegatus, Apocalypsin.—Refert autem Tertullianus, quod Romæ, [al. a Nerone] missus in ferventis olei dolium, purior et vegetior exierit, quam intravit. Adv. Jovin. l. i. tom. 4. p. 169.

according to some copies, says, it was done at Rome, according to others, in the time of Nero. However in the same place, as well as elsewhere, Jerom expressly says, that John was banished into Patmos by Domitian. And [i] in the other place, where he mentions the casting St. John into boiling oil, he says: 'and presently afterwards he was banished 'into the island Patmos.' Therefore that other trial, which St. John met with, was in the same reign, that is, Domitian's. And indeed Jerom always supposes St. John's banishment to have been in that reign: as he particularly relates in the ninth chapter of his book of Illustrious Men. Let me add, that if the story of St. John's being put into a vessel of scalding oil be a fable and a fiction, it must be hazardous to build an argument upon it.

It follows in Newton: 'Epiphanius represents the gospel 'of John as written in the time of Domitian, and the Apo-'calypse even before that of Nero.' I have already said enough of Epiphanius in considering the opinion of Grotius. However, as one would think, Sir Isaac Newton had little reason to mention Epiphanius, when he does not follow him. He says, that St. John was banished into Patmos in the time of Claudius: Sir Isaac, not till near the end of the reign of Nero.

'Arethas,' says [k] Sir Isaac, 'in the beginning of his com-'mentary quotes the opinion of Irenæus from Eusebius, but 'does not follow it. For he afterwards affirms, that the 'Apocalypse was written before the destruction of Jerusa-'lem, and that former commentators had expounded the 'sixth seal of that destruction.'

To which I answer. Arethas does indeed say, that [l] some interpreters had explained things under the sixth seal, as relating to the destruction of Jerusalem by Vespasian: but they were some only, not the most. Yea, he presently afterwards says, that the most interpreted it otherwise. Nor does he say, that any of those commentators were of opinion, that the Apocalypse was written before the destruction of Jerusalem. Arethas seems to have been of opinion, that things, which had come to pass long before, might be represented in the Revelation. Therefore immediately before

[i] Sed si legamus ecclesiasticas historias, in quibus fertur, quod et ipse propter martyrium sit missus in ferventis olei dolium, et inde ad suscipiendam coronam Christi athleta processerit, statimque relegatus in Patmon insulam sit, &c. Comm. in Matt. xx. 23. tom. 4. P. i. p. 92.

[k] As before, p. 236.

[l] *Τινες δε ταυτα εις την υπο Ουεσπασιανα γινομενην πολιορκιαν εξελαβον, παντα τα ειρημενα τροπολογησαντες. Οι δε πλειστοι των ερμηνευτων.* κ. λ. Areth. cap. 18. p. 709. A.

that passage, explaining Rev. vi. 12, 13, he says: 'What[m] 'is the opening of the sixth seal? It is the cross and death 'of the Lord, followed by his resurrection, desirable to all 'faithful and understanding men. "And lo, there was a 'great earthquake." Manifestly denoting, says he, the signs 'that happened during the crucifixion, the shaking of the 'earth, the darkness of the sun, the turning the moon into 'blood. For when it was full moon, being the fourteenth 'day, how was it possible, that the sun should be eclipsed 'by its interposition?'

However, I must not conceal what he says afterwards, in another chapter of his[n] Commentary. He is explaining Rev. vii. 4—8. 'These, says he who instructs the evan- 'gelist, will not partake in the calamities inflicted by the 'Romans. For the destruction caused by the Romans had 'not fallen upon the Jews, when the evangelist received 'these instructions. Nor was he at Jerusalem, but in Ionia, 'where is Ephesus: for he stayed at Jerusalem no more 'than fourteen years.——And after the death of our Lord's 'mother, he left Judea, and went to Ephesus: as[o] tradition 'says: where also, as is said, he had the revelation of future 'things.' But how can we rely upon a writer of the sixth century for these particulars; that John did not stay at Jerusalem more than fourteen years: that he left Judea upon the death of our Lord's mother, and then went to Ephesus: when we can evidently perceive from the history in the Acts, that in the fourteenth year after our Lord's ascension, there were no christian converts at Ephesus: and that the church at Ephesus was not founded by St. Paul, till several years afterwards? What avails it to refer to such passages as these? Which, when looked into and examined, contain no certain assurances of any thing. And Sir Isaac Newton himself says: 'It[p] seems to me, that Peter and 'John stayed with their churches in Judea and Syria, till 'the Romans made war upon their nation, that is, till the 'twelfth year of Nero,' or A. D. 66.

We proceed with this great man's arguments, who adds: 'With[q] the opinion of the first commentators agrees the 'tradition of the churches of Syria, preserved to this day in 'the title of the Syriac version of the Apocalypse, which 'title is this: "The Revelation, which was made to John the

[m] Τις δε ἡ λυσις της ἑκτης σφραγιδος; Ὁ ϛαυρος τϐ Κυριϐ και θανατος, οἱς ηκολϐθησεν ἡ ευκταια πασι πιϛοις τε και αισθητοις αναϛασις. κ. λ. Cap. 18. p. 708. C. D.

[n] Cap. xix. p. 713, 714.

[o] — αλλα προς Εφεσον μεταϛηναι αυτον λογος, καθ' ἡν, ὡς ειρηται. κ. λ. Ibid. p. 714. in.

[p] As before, p. 243.

[q] P. 236, 237.

'evangelist by God in the island Patmos, into which he 'was banished by Nero Cæsar." ' But how comes it to pass, that the tradition of the churches of Syria is alleged here, when the Apocalypse was not generally received by them? Moreover in the titles of the books of the New Testament received by them, there are manifest errors. Nor[r] can we say when the Syriac version of the Apocalypse was made: nor[s] is it impossible that the authors of that title might mean Domitian by Nero. It is not a greater error, than that of supposing the epistle of James to have been written by James the son of Zebedee.

Again, says the celebrated Newton: 'The[t] same is con- 'firmed by a story told by Eusebius out of Clemens Alex- 'andrinus, and other ancient authors, concerning a youth, 'whom St. John, some time after his return from Patmos, 'committed to the care of the bishop of a certain city. 'This is a story of many years, and requires, that John 'should have returned from Patmos rather at the death of 'Nero, than at that of Domitian.'

But, first, if this be only a feigned story, or apologue, as some have thought, contrived to convey moral instruction; circumstances ought not to be strained, nor the truth of history be founded upon it. Secondly, we must take the story, as it is related by Clement, and other ancient authors. Clement placeth it after the death of the tyrant, by whom John had been banished: and Eusebius[u] supposeth him to mean Domitian. Thirdly, if St. John lived in Asia two, or three, or four years after his return from Patmos, that is time enough for the events of this story.

Sir Isaac adds in the same place: 'And John in his old 'age was so infirm, as to be carried to church, dying above 'ninety years old: and therefore could not be then sup- 'posed able to ride after the thief.'

Nevertheless in the original account, which we have of

[r] Ad Neronis imperium hoc exilium Syrus refert. Verum incerta est quam maxime hujus versionis ætas, nulloque gaudet socio. Lamp. Proleg. l. i. cap. 4. sect. vii.

Quapropter nihil in hisce est, quod Syrum ab erroris culpâ liberare possit; quemadmodum nec supra erat, quod Epiphanium in nomine Claudii tueretur. Illud tantummodo adnotatum volo Syriacam Apocalypseos versionem haud æqualem cæterorum librorum interpretationi videri, uti nec primi codices in Europam adlati appositam habuerunt, quam demum Ludovicus de Dieu MDCXXVII. in lucem primum produxit, &c. Ch. Cellarius de septem ecclesiis Asiæ num. xvii. p. 428.

[s] Sed forsan aliquis, honoris interpretis Syri solicitus et cupidus, posset in illius gratiam asserere, illum non Neronem, sed Domitianum, alterum Neronem, seu portionem Neronis, ut vocatur Tertulliano, &c. Le Moyne, Var. Sacr. tom. II. p. 1019.

[t] As above, p. 237.

[u] H. E. l. 3. cap. 23.

this affair, St. John is expressly called[v] an old man: Sir Isaac therefore has no right to make him young; for that would be making a new story. If a man allows himself so to do, and argues upon it; the necessary consequence is, that he deceives himself and others.

Upon the whole, I see not much weight in any of these arguments of Sir Isaac Newton; and must adhere to the common opinion, that St. John was banished into Patmos, in the reign of Domitian, and by virtue of his edicts for persecuting the christians, in the latter part of his reign. Says Mr. Lampe: 'All[w] antiquity is agreed, that St. John's 'banishment was by order of Domitian.'

VI. We should now inquire, when St. John was released, or how long his banishment lasted.

According to Tertullian, Domitian's persecution[x] was very short, and the emperor himself, before he died, recalled those whom he had banished. Hegesippus likewise says, that[y] Domitian by an edict put an end to the persecution which he had ordered.

Eusebius says, 'that[z] after the death of Domitian, John 'returned from his banishment.' And before, in another chapter of the same book, he said more largely: 'After[a] 'Domitian had reigned fifteen years, Nerva succeeded him, 'and the Roman senate decreed, that the honourable titles 'bestowed upon Domitian should be abrogated, and more- 'over, that they who had been banished by him might re- 'turn to their homes, and repossess their goods, of which they 'had been unjustly deprived. This we learn from such as 'have written the history of those times. Then therefore, 'as our ancestors say, the apostle John returned from his 'banishment, and again took up his abode at Ephesus.'

Jerom, in his book of Illustrious Men, says: 'When[b] 'Domitian had been killed, and his edicts had been repeal- 'ed by the senate, because of their excessive cruelty, John 'returned to Ephesus, in the time of the emperor Nerva.'

I place below a passage of[c] the martyrdom of Timothy

[v] — *επιλαθομενος της ηλικιας αυτε—τι με φευγεις—τον γυμνον, τον γεροντα; προσελθοντα δε τον γεροντα περιελαβεν. κ. λ.* Clem. ap. Euseb. H. E. l. 3. c. 23. p. 93. [w] Tota antiquitas in eo abunde consentit, quod Domitianus exilii Joannis auctor fuerit. Lamp. Proleg. l. i. cap. 4. sect. viii. [x] Cœptum repressit, restitutis etiam quos relegaverat. Apol. cap. v. vid. supr. p. 415, note [b].

[y] — *καταπαυσαι δε δια προσταγματος τον κατα της εκκλησιας διωγμον.* Ap. Euseb. H. E. l. 3. cap. 20. p. 90. B. [z] — *απο της κατα την νησον μετα την Δομετιανε τελευτην επανελθων φυγης.* Eus. H. E. l. 3. cap. 23. in. [a] H. E. l. 3. cap. 20. p. 90. B. C.

[b] See Vol. ii. ch. cxiv. num. viii. 4. [c] *Νερβα δε τε Ρωμαϊκε κρατες το σκηπτρον αναδεδεγμενε, ὁ θεολογος Ιωαννης, της ὑπερορια φυγης αφεθεις, κα-*

in Photius, and another[d] of Suidas, saying, that after Domitian's death, when Nerva was emperor, St. John returned from his banishment.

This is also agreeable to the general accounts in[e] Dion Cassius, and[f] the author of the Deaths of Persecutors.

Indeed, Hegesippus and Tertullian, as before observed, intimate, that the persecution of Domitian ended before his death. But it is very remarkable, that Eusebius[g] having quoted both of them, gives a different account, as we saw just now. And, as learned men have observed, it is a great prejudice to their authority in this point, that Eusebius does not follow them, but presently afterwards differs from them.

It seems probable therefore, that St. John, and other exiles, did not return from their banishment, until after the death of Domitian: which[h] is the opinion of Basnage, and likewise of[i] Cellarius.

Domitian[k] is computed to have died, Sept. 18, A. D. 96, after having reigned fifteen years, and some days. Nerva[l] died the 27th day of Jan. 98, after having reigned one year, four months, and nine days. Therefore Trajan began his reign, Jan. 27, A. D. 98.

If the persecution of Domitian began in the fourteenth year of his reign, and St. John was sent to Patmos that year, and restored in the beginning of the reign of Nerva, his[m] exile could not last more than two years, perhaps not much above a year.

If St. John's life reached to the third year of the reign of Trajan, which is the opinion of Cave[n] and many others, he

ταγεται προς Εφεσον, ἡς και προτερον απο Δομετιανε πεφυγαδευτο. Ap. Phot. Cod. 254. p. 1404.

[d] Vid. Suid. voce Νερβας.

[e] Και ὁ Νερουας τες τε κρινομενες επ' ασεβειᾳ αφηκε, και τες φευγοντας κατηγαγε. κ. λ. Dio. l. 62. in. p. 769.

[f] De M. P. cap. 3.

[g] H. E. l. 3. cap. 20.

[h] Utrum Domitianus decretum revocârit, difficilis quæstio est. Sic enim antiquorum nonnullis visum. Hegesippus—Hegesippo assentitur et Tertullianus.—Contra vero nobilis historicus Dio, qui rerum Romanarum Hegesippo peritior erat, et Tertulliano, disertissime testatur, Nervæ indulgentiâ revocatos fuisse christianos: 'Nerva autem eos qui damnati erant impietatis absolvit, exulesque restituit.' Neque alia mens Lactantio de Mort. Pers. cap. 3. Basnag. ann. 96. num. iv.

[i] Cellar. de Septem Ecclesiis Asiæ. cap. xvii.—xx.

[k] Basnag. ann. 96. n. xiii.

[l] Basn. A. D. 98. i. Pagi ann. 98. ii.

[m] In alterum tantum annum ad summum duravit, quando Nerva succedens Domitiano exules revocavit, et cum eis Joannem, uti ex vetustiorum fide refert Eusebius, l. 3. H. E. cap. 20.—Quæ quidem eo majorem fidem merentur, quia ipse Dio, seu ex eo Xiphilinus, revocationem exulum christianorum Nervæ tribuit. Lampe, Prol. l. 1. cap. 4. sect. ix. Vid. et Cellar. ubi supra, cap. xvii.

[n] Interfecto Domitiano, Ephesum rediit, ann. Chr. 97, in quâ, ut et in regionibus circumvicinis, reliquum vitæ transegit,

lived three years after his return from Patmos: if it reached to the fourth year of Trajan, as[o] Basnage thought, he must have lived four years after his return.

Or, in other words: if St. John returned about the end of the year 96, or the beginning of 97, and did not die till the year 101, he lived four years in Asia, after his return from Patmos. If he died in the year 100, he lived three years after his return.

VII. Having now said of St. John all that is needful by way of history, we come to his writings, of which there are five generally ascribed to him: a gospel, three epistles, and the Revelation: two of which, the gospel, and the first epistle, are universally received as genuine.

Now I speak of the gospel only. And here in the first place I shall recite the accounts of the ancients, but chiefly such as concern the time when it was written; omitting many other testimonies, as not necessary to be mentioned now, though very valuable in themselves: after which we will observe the judgments of learned moderns concerning the same point; I mean, the time when it was written.

Irenæus, having spoken of the gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, adds: 'Afterwards[p] John, the disciple of the 'Lord, who also leaned upon his breast, likewise published 'a gospel, whilst he dwelled at Ephesus in Asia.'

In another place he says: 'John[q] the disciple of the 'Lord declaring this faith, and by the publication of the 'gospel designing to root out the error, which had been 'sown among men by Cerinthus, and long before by those 'who are called Nicolaitans——thus began in the doctrine, 'which is according to the gospel: "In the beginning was 'the Word."'

In another place of the same ancient writer are these expressions: 'As[r] John the disciple of the Lord assures us,

et—anno Chr. 100, Trajani 3, juxta Eusebium et Hieronymum, anno uno aut altero centenario major—in Domino placide obdormivit. Cav. H. L. T. I. p. 16.

[o] Cæterum cum ex antiquâ traditione haustum videatur, Joannem senio confectum, 68 post passionem anno mortuum esse, quæ in 33 æræ nostræ incidit, probabilis est conjectura, Joannem anno labente finem hujus lucis invenisse. Basn. A. 101. n. ii.

[p] See Vol. ii. p. 170.

[q] Hanc fidem annuntians Joannes Domini discipulus, volens per evangelii annuntiationem auferre eum, qui a Cerintho inseminatus erat hominibus errorem, et multo prius ab his qui dicuntur Nicolaïtæ, qui sunt vulsio ejus, quæ falso cognominatur scientia.—Sic inchoavit in eâ quæ est secundum evangelium doctrinâ. In principio erat verbum, &c. Adv. Hær. l. 3. cap. xi. p. 188. Bened.

[r] ——— quemadmodum Joannes Domini discipulus confirmat, dicens, 'Hæc 'autem scripta sunt, ut credatis, quoniam Jesus est Filius Dei, et ut credentes 'vitam æternam habeatis in nomine ejus;' providens has blasphemas regulas,

'saying: "But these are written, that ye might believe, 'that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing 'ye might have life through his name." [Ch. xx. 30.] 'Foreseeing these blasphemous notions that divide the 'Lord, so far as it is in their power.'

In the preceding passage Irenæus speaks, as if St. John's gospel was written after the rise of Cerinthus, and other heresies: but here he seems to say, that it was written before them, and foreseeing them. In like manner afterwards, in the same chapter, he says of Paul; 'As[s] he says: "It is 'Christ that died, yea, rather that is risen, who is at the right 'hand of God," Rom. viii. 34. And again, "Knowing that 'Christ being raised from the dead, dies no more," ch. vi. '9. For he also foreseeing by the spirit the divisions of evil 'teachers, and being desirous to cut off from them all occa-'sion of dissension, says what has been just quoted.'

Clement of Alexandria, speaking of the order of the gospels, according to what he had received from presbyters of more ancient times, says: 'Last[t] of all, John observing, 'that in other gospels those things were related, which con-'cern the humanity of Christ, and being persuaded by his 'friends, and also moved by the Spirit of God, he wrote a 'spiritual gospel.' Here it is supposed, not only that St. John wrote the last of the four, but likewise, that he had seen the gospels of the other three evangelists.

Origen[u] speaks of all the four gospels in our present order, that is, Matthew's first, and John's last.

A long passage of Eusebius concerning St. John's gospel may be seen, Vol. iv. p. 94—96. It cannot be omitted here. But it shall be abridged. 'And that it has been justly 'placed by the ancients the fourth in order, and after the 'other three, may be made evident.——For Matthew de-'livered his gospel to the Hebrews.——And when Mark 'and Luke also had published the gospels according to 'them, it is said, that John, who all this while had preach-'ed by word of mouth, was at length induced to write for 'this reason. The three first written gospels being now 'delivered to all men, and to John himself, it is said, that 'he approved them, and confirmed the truth of their narra-

quæ dividant Dominum quantum ex ipsis attinet, ex alterâ et alterâ substantiâ dicentes eum factum. Adv. Hær. l. 3. cap. 16. n. 5. p. 206.

[s] —— quemadmodum ipse ait: 'Simul autem Christus mortuus est, immo 'et resurrexit.'——Et iterum: 'Scientes quoniam Christus resurgens a mor-'tuis, jam non moritur.' Prævidens enim et ipse per Spiritum subdivisiones malorum magistrorum, et omnem ipsorum occasionem dissensionis volens abscindere, ait quæ prædicta sunt. Ibid. n. 9. p. 207.

[t] See Vol. ii. p. 226.

[u] Ib. p. 494.

'tion by his own testimony, saying: There was only want-
'ing a written account of the things done by Christ, in the
'former part, and near the beginning of his preaching——
'And, certainly, that observation is true——.'

Epiphanius[v] speaks of St. John's gospel as the last of the four. He also says, that St. John wrote it, after he had long declined so doing through humility, when he was ninety years of age, and when he had lived in Asia many years, after his return thither from Patmos, in the time of the emperor Claudius. He moreover says in several places, that this gospel was occasioned by the errors of the Ebionites, the Cerinthians, and other heretics.

According to[w] the Syrian churches, St. John wrote his gospel at Ephesus.

My readers are again referred to the noble passage[x] of Theodore, bishop of Mopsuestia, concerning the four gospels, and to the remarks upon it.

Jerom, in his book of Illustrious Men, says: 'John[y] the
'apostle wrote a gospel at the desire of the bishops of Asia,
'against Cerinthus, and other heretics, and especially the
'doctrine of the Ebionites, then springing up, who say,
'that Christ did not exist before his birth of Mary: for
'which reason he was obliged to declare his divine nativity.
'Another reason of his writing is also mentioned; which is,
'that after having read the volumes of Matthew, Mark, and
'Luke, he expressed his approbation of their history as
'true: but observed, that they had recorded an account of
'but one year of our Lord's ministry, even the last, after the
'imprisonment of John, in which also he suffered. Omitting
'therefore [very much] that year, the history of which had
'been written by the other three, he related the acts of the
'preceding time, before John was shut up in prison; as
'may appear to those, who read the four evangelists: which
'may be of use to account for the seeming difference be-
'tween John and the rest.'

According to[z] Augustine, St. John is the last of the four evangelists.

Chrysostom,[a] assigning the reasons of St. John's writing his gospel, supposeth that he did not write till after the destruction of Jerusalem.

Paulinus says: 'It[b] had been handed down by tradition,
'that John survived all the other apostles, and wrote the
'last of the four evangelists, and so as to confirm their most

[v] See Vol. iv. p. 188, 189.
[w] P. 321.
[x] P. 398, 399.
[y] P. 445.
[z] P. 501.
[a] P. 538, 541.
[b] P. 588.

'certain history.' And he observes, 'that[c] in the beginning 'of St. John's gospel all heretics are confuted, particularly 'Arius, Sabellius, Marcion, and the Manichees.'

Cosmas of Alexandria says, 'that[d] when John dwelt at 'Ephesus, there were delivered to him by the faithful, the 'writings of the other three evangelists. Receiving them 'he said, that what they had written was well written: but 'some things were omitted by them, which were needful to 'be related. And being desired by the faithful, he also 'published his writing, as a kind of supplement to the rest, 'containing such things as these: the wedding at Cana; 'the history of Nicodemus; the woman of Samaria; the 'nobleman, [or courtier, John iv. 46—54.] the man blind 'from his birth; Lazarus; the indignation of Judas at the 'woman that anointed the Lord with ointment: the Greeks 'that came to Jesus; his washing the disciples' feet; and 'suitable instructions upon several occasions, and the pro-'mise of the Comforter; and concerning the deity of Christ, 'expressly and clearly at the beginning, and premising that, 'as the foundation of his work: all which things had been 'omitted by the rest.'

Isidore of Seville says, that[e] John wrote the last, in Asia.

Theophylact computed, that[f] St. John wrote about two and thirty years after Christ's ascension.

Euthymius, that[g] it was not written until many years after the destruction of Jerusalem.

Nicephorus Callisti says, that[h] John wrote last of all, about six and thirty years after the Lord's ascension to heaven.

VIII. Having seen these testimonies of the ancients to St. John's gospel, and the time of it, I would now observe the judgments of learned moderns.

According to[i] Mill's computation St. John wrote his gospel at Ephesus, in the year of Christ 97, about one year before his death.

Fabricius[k] speaks to the like purpose.

Le Clerc[l] likewise placeth the writing of this gospel in the year 97.

[c] Ibid. p. 588. [d] This Vol. p. 94. [e] Ibid. p. 137.
[f] Ibid. p. 160. [g] Ibid. p. 166. [h] Ibid. p. 168.

[i] Et quidem Ephesum ab exilio reversus Joannes uno ante mortem anno scripsit evangelium. Mil. Prol. num. 181.

[k] Evangelium Græce edidit Ephesi, omnium postremus, jam nonagenario major, cum e Patmo reversus esset post Domitiani necem, quæ anno 96 contigit. Bib. Gr. l. 4. cap. v. T. III. p. 139.

[l] Hist. E. An. 97. num. i.

Mr. Jones argues that[m] it was written about the year 98, and not before 97.

The late Mr. Wetstein thought, that[n] this gospel might be written about the year 32, after our Lord's ascension: and dislikes the supposition, that it was written by St. John in decrepit old age.

Basnage[o] was inclined to think, that this gospel was written before the destruction of Jerusalem. His reasons will be alleged, and considered by and by.

Mr. Lampe was of opinion, that[p] this gospel was written in the latter part of the reign of Nero, before the destruction of Jerusalem.

IX. I shall now propose an argument concerning the date of this gospel.

There are two considerations, principally, which lead me to think, that St. John's gospel was written before the destruction of Jerusalem, or about the time of that event: these I shall first mention, and then take notice of divers others, observable in learned moderns.

1. It is likely, that St. John wrote in a short time after the other evangelists. Their gospels were soon brought to him: and if he thought fit to confirm them, or to write any thing by way of supplement, he would do it in a short time. The first three gospels, very probably, were written and published before the end of the year 64, or in 65, at the farthest. If they were brought to St. John in 65, or 66, he would not defer more, or not much more, than a year, or two, to publish his history of Jesus, and make the account complete.

I do not presume to say exactly the year in which this gospel was written: but I think it might be written and published in the year 68.

This argument offered itself to Mr. Whiston's thoughts, and is thus expressed by him: 'That[q] occasion of John's 'writing his gospel, mentioned by the ancients, viz. the 'bringing the other three gospels to him, and his observing

[m] New and Full Method, Vol. III. p. 139.

[n] Hinc etiam consequitur, evangelium Joannis non ab eo decrepito, et fere centenario, et post mortem Clementis, sed diu antea fuisse editum, adeoque inscriptionem Codicum Græcorum, qui illud evangelium anno tricesimo secundo post ascensionem Christi scriptum fuisse testantur, ad verum proprius accedere: præcipue cum ratio nulla sit, cur Joannes scriptionem in tam longum tempus differre debuerit. Wetst. Proleg. ad duas Clement. Ep. sub fin.

[o] Ann. 97. num. xii.

[p] Putem ergo non contemnendas esse rationes, quæ ante excidium Hierosolymitanum evangelium nostrum sub extremis forte Neronis temporibus conscriptum esse persuadent. Proleg. l. 2. cap. 2. num. ix.

[q] Essay on the Apostolical Constitutions, p. 38, 39.

'their deficiency, as to the acts of Christ before the Baptist's 'imprisonment, does much better agree with this time, just 'after the publication of those gospels, than with that above 'thirty years later, to which its writing is now ordinarily 'ascribed.'

And is it not a strange supposition, that all the other three gospels should have been written by the year 60, or thereabout, and St. John's not till the year 97, or 98, that is, more than thirty years after the others? When likewise he must have been of a very great age, and scarcely fit for such a work as this.

2. The second consideration is the suitableness of St. John's gospel to the circumstances of things before the overthrow of the Jews, or about that time.

Mr. Lampe has observed, that[r] the great design of St. John in writing his gospel seems to have been, to show, how inexcusable the Jews were in not receiving Jesus as the Christ, and to vindicate the providence of God in the calamities already befallen, or now coming upon them. If that appear to be the design of St. John in writing his gospel, it will very much strengthen the supposition, that it was written before the destruction of Jerusalem was completed.

St. John says, ch. xx. 31, "These things are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name." That is, 'This history has been written, that they 'who believe, may be confirmed in their faith, and that all 'others, who yet believe not, may believe in Jesus, as the 'Christ, the Son of God, and obtain that life, which he 'promiseth to those who believe in him, and obey him.'

That is the design of all the evangelists; and their histories are a sufficient ground and reason of this belief. But St. John's gospel contains an ample confirmation of all that they have said, with valuable additions, and more plain and frequent assurances, that Jesus is not only a prophet, and messenger of God, but the Christ, the Son of God, or that great prophet, that should come into the world: whereby all are rendered inexcusable in rejecting him, and especially

[r] Totam porro œconomiam hujus evangelii ita esse digestam, ut ad convincendos ac *αναπολογητες* reddendos Judæos spectaret, capite sequenti ostendemus. Prolegom. in Joan. l. 2. cap. 3. sect. ii.

Imminens etiam Judææ pernicies occasionem maxime opportunam conscribendo libro dabat, in quo Joannis animus erat hujus ipsius judicii imminentis æquitatem defendere, et tentare, an Judæi ex hoc Reipublicæ naufragio magno agmine in Asiam enatantes, ad recipiendum unicum mundi Salvatorem hoc medio permoveri possint. Ibid. l. 2. cap. 2. sect. xv. Vid. et l. 2. cap. 3. num. iii. not. (*b*).

the Jews, among whom he preached, and wrought many miracles, and whom he often called to receive him as the Christ. This[s] runs through St. John's gospel from the beginning to the end, or near the end of the twelfth chapter.

Even in the introduction, he says, ch. i. 7, "John came for a witness, to bear witness of the light, that all men through him might believe. Ver. 8, He was not that light, but was sent to bear witness of that light. Ver. 9, That was the true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." 'That is, he was designed to be an universal 'blessing: and he has done all that was fit to be done, to 'enlighten all men in the knowledge of God, and true reli-'gion.' Ver. 14, "And we beheld his glory," we his disciples, and all who impartially attended, "beheld his glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father:" that is, the glory peculiar to the promised Messiah. Again, at ver. 18, he styles him "the only-begotten son." Here St. John may be supposed to declare his present faith, or to make a profession of the faith, which he had at the time of his writing. Having so done, he proceeds in the history. Ver. 19, 20, "And this is the record of John, when the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem, to ask him, Who art thou." He answered, that he was not the Christ, but his harbinger, or fore-runner, the person spoken of by Isaiah. And he declares the transcendent greatness of him, who was about to appear, and was already among them, ver. 21—28. Then at ver. 29, "The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith: Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world." Undoubtedly, by that character meaning the Messiah, and understood by all so to mean. See also ver. 30, 31, 32, 33. Then at ver. 34, "And I saw, and bare record, that this is the Son of God:" or the Christ. And ver. 35, 36, "Again, the next day after, John stood, and two of his disciples. And looking upon Jesus, as he walked, he saith: Behold the Lamb of God." He tells every body, that Jesus is the Christ, though not always in

[s] Priora duodecim capita evidentissime ea commemorent, quæ severum et tremendum illud Dei in Judæos judicium defendunt Talia enim facta et dicta continuo ordine proponunt, quæ non in obscuro angulo, sed coram totâ gente judaïcâ edita sunt, nullamque exceptionem patiuntur.——Atque hæc est ratio, cur Joannes secundum festa Judæorum historiam evangelicam digerat. Inde enim innotescit, Jesum ea diligenter frequentâsse, atque in iis publice coram toto populo judaïco se satis superque manifestâsse. Istud enim evangelistæ nostro plane privum est, ut ea potissimum narret, quæ a Domino nostro Hierosolymis, quin in ipso templo, gesta atque dicta sunt; paucis tantum interjectis, quæ eum etiam Judæam, Samariam, Galilæam, radiis gloriæ suæ cœlestis abunde illustrâsse, atque ita nullam partem regionis Judæorum vacuam reliquisse, probant. Lamp. Ibid. l. 2. cap. 4. num. xxxiii. xxxiv.

the same terms. And to finish our account of John the Baptist. In ch. iii. 25—36, is the last testimony borne by him to Jesus: and it is very strong and full. He declares he was not himself the Christ, "but was sent before him. To him," says he, "God giveth not the spirit by measure. The Father loveth the Son, and hath put all things into his hands.——He that believeth on the Son, hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son, shall not see life: but the wrath of God abideth on him."

Having gone through the Baptist's testimony, as here recorded, we look back to ch. i. 4—42, where Andrew finds his brother Simon, and says to him: "We have found the Messiah." Then ver. 45—51, "Philip findeth Nathanael, and saith to him: We have found him, of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets did write, Jesus of Nazareth." Nathanael likewise is convinced, and says: "Rabbi, thou art the Son of God; thou art the king of Israel." So writes St. John, showing, that the pious and well-disposed among the Jews readily received Jesus as the Christ. And thereby showing likewise, the great unreasonableness, and extreme perverseness of those who did not believe in him after all the proofs which he set before them in the course of his most powerful ministry. As the evangelist most justly says, near the conclusion of this part of his gospel. Ch. xii. 37, "But though he had done so many miracles among them, yet they believed not on him." And see what follows there.

Ch. ii. 11. After the account of the miracle at Cana. "This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested forth his glory:" that is, the glory of the Messiah; "and his disciples believed on him:" or were confirmed in their belief that he was the Christ.

Soon after this, Jesus went up to Jerusalem at the passover, and cleansed the temple, saying: "Make not my Father's house an house of merchandise," ch. ii. 13—17. By the work itself, and by his words, manifesting himself to be the Messiah. I omit other things in the remaining part of that chapter, which an attentive reader will take notice of.

Then, ch. iii. 1—21, is the history of Nicodemus, who, whilst Jesus was this time at Jerusalem, made him a private visit. He immediately professeth faith in him, as a prophet. But our Lord tells him plainly, that he was the Messiah, and demands a suitable regard from him. He likewise sets before Nicodemus the nature of his design, for preventing, or for removing all worldly expectations from him. He likewise intimates the call of the Gentiles, and the judgments

coming upon the Jewish people, if they should persist in unbelief. " For," says he, " as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, so must the Son of man be lifted up: that whosoever believeth in him might not perish, but have everlasting life.——For God sent not his son," the Messiah, " into the world to condemn the world: but that through him the world," Gentiles as well as Jews, " might be saved." And what there follows.

Jesus going through Samaria, from Jerusalem, in his way to Galilee, meets with a woman of that country. Ch. iv. 19, " The woman saith unto him: Sir, I perceive that thou art a prophet."——And ver. 25, 26, " The woman saith unto him: I know that the Messiah cometh," or is soon to appear. ——" Jesus saith unto her: I that speak unto thee am he." ———The woman left him, and went into the city, " and saith unto the men: Come, see a man that has told me all things that ever I did. Is not this the Christ?" Afterwards, ver. 42, " Many of that place said unto the woman: now we believe, not because of thy saying: for we have heard him ourselves, and know, that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world." Here is another instance of our Lord's freely declaring himself to be the Christ, and of his accepting a profession of faith in himself, as such. And the ready faith of these Samaritans aggravates the continued unbelief of the Jews, on whom more culture had been bestowed.

Ch. v. 1, " After this there was a feast of the Jews, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem." By many this is thought to be the passover. By others it is reckoned some other feast between the last-mentioned, and the next passover of our Lord's ministry. However that may be, at this season our Lord healed the lame man at the pool of Bethesda, on the sabbath day, and bid him carry his bed, and go home. " Therefore did the Jews persecute Jesus, and sought to slay him, because he had done these things on the sabbath day. But Jesus answered them: " My Father worketh hitherto, and I work," ver 16, 17. The Jews charge him with blasphemy. Our Lord vindicates himself, and claims the character of the Messiah in high terms: and assures them, " that all judgment had been committed unto the Son," meaning himself, the Messiah: " that all men might honour the Son, even as they honour the Father," ver. 21—23. And, for proof, he refers to their scriptures, the testimony of John, and the works which he had wrought among them, in the Father's name, ver. 24—47.

Ch. vi. 1—3, We perceive our Lord to be in Galilee,

whither he had gone from Judea. Then at ver. 4, " And the passover, a feast of the Jews, was nigh." After which follows the miracle of the five loaves and two fishes, for feeding five thousand. " Then those men, when they had seen the miracle which Jesus did, said, This is of a truth that prophet which should come into the world :" or the expected Messiah. Their notion of the kingdom, belonging to that character, being worldly and carnal, and they, looking for worldly advantages, " would have come, and taken him by force, to make him a king :" so that our Lord found it needful to " depart into a mountain himself alone." The disciples in the mean time took shipping, and he came to them walking upon the sea. When they had received him, " immediately the ship was at the land whither they were going," ver. 14—21. The people, having been disappointed, came to him as soon as they could at Capernaum ; where our Lord takes an opportunity to reprove their carnal temper, and instructs them in the design of the Messiah, and the nature of his kingdom. And still taking upon himself that character, and requiring faith in him as such, he says : " I am the bread of life.——And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life.——I am the living bread, which came down from heaven. If any man eat this bread, he shall live for ever. And the bread that I will give him is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.——Many therefore of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him." But Peter, in the name of the twelve, and, possibly, in the name also of some others, followers of Jesus, said : " To whom shall we go ? Thou hast the words of eternal life. And we believe, and are sure, that thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," ver. 22—69.

Ch. vii. 1, 2, " After these things Jesus walked in Galilee : for he would not walk in Judea, because the Jews sought to kill him. Now the Jews' feast of tabernacles was at hand."——ver 14, " Now about the midst of the feast, Jesus went up into the temple, and taught." Ver. 25, 26, " Then said some of them of Jerusalem——Do the rulers know indeed, that this is the very Christ ?" Ver. 31, " And many of the people believed on him, and said : When Christ cometh, will he do more miracles than these, which this man has done ?" Ver. 37, 38, " In the last day, the great day of the feast, Jesus stood, and cried : If any man thirst, let him come to me, and drink."——He speaks of himself in the character of the Messiah, and calls on all men to come to

him, as such, and receive the great blessings, which he is able to bestow. And at ver. 40, 41, " Many of the people, therefore, when they heard this saying, said: This is the prophet. Others said: This is the Christ."

Ch. viii. 12—23, Our Lord is still at Jerusalem. And at ver 12, " Then spake Jesus unto them, saying: I am the light of the world:" claiming the character of the Messiah, and declaring also the advantages of believing in him, and the sad consequence of not receiving him. Ver. 21, " Then said Jesus again unto them; I go my way, and ye shall seek me, and shall die in your sins." Ver. 24, " I said therefore unto you, that ye shall die in your sins. For if ye believe not that I am he," the Messiah, " ye shall die in your sins:" that is, ye will bring upon yourselves heavy judgments and calamities. Ver. 47, " He that is of God, heareth God's words: ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God."——Ver. 56, " Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day."——Does not our Lord in all this propose himself to them as the Messiah, require their faith in him as such, and plainly intimate the calamities that would befall them, if they should continue to reject him?

Nor is there any inconsistency in what is here observed, and the accounts of the other evangelists. After Peter had made a profession of his faith, it is said, Matt. xvi. 20, " Then charged he his disciples, that they should tell no man that he was the Christ." And compare Mark viii. 30, and Luke ix. 21. Nevertheless, he was not unwilling to be thought of in that character. When Simon Peter had said by way of answer to the question that had been put to the disciples, " thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God:" our Lord was greatly pleased, and pronounced him blessed upon that account: and he was desirous that all should receive him as the Messiah. It was the design of his own, and his forerunner's preaching, as recorded in all the evangelists, the first three, as well as St. John. They called upon all men " to repent, for the kingdom of heaven," or of God, by the Messiah, " is at hand." So Mark i. 14, 15. And himself says, Matt. xii. 28, " If I cast out dæmons by the Spirit of God, then is the kingdom of God come unto you." And Luke xvii. 21, " Behold the kingdom of God is among you," or in the midst of you, not within you, as we render it: but he tells them that the kingdom of the Messiah was already begun to be set up among them. When our Lord was baptized, " there came a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." Or, this is the Messiah: as recorded by all the first three evan-

gelists: Matt. iii. 17; Mark i. 11; Luke iii. 22. And in them our Lord accepts applications to him, and confessions of faith in him, in the character of "the Son of David," and "the Son of God," both which are the same as the Messiah. Of the former there are many instances: of the latter I mention one. Matt. xiv. 33, "Then they that were in the ship came, and worshipped him, saying: Thou art the Son of God." And when he entered into Jerusalem, he accepted the acclamations of the multitude, which cried, "Hosanna to the Son of David: blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord: blessed is the king that cometh in the name of the Lord." Matt. xxi. 1—16; Mark xi. 1—11; Luke xix. 28—40. He sometimes laments the small success of his preaching, and that so few received him. But acquiesceth in the event. As in Luke vii. 31—35; Matt. xi. 16—26; Luke x. 21—24. And he even expresseth a surprise, that the pharisees and others did not discern the signs of the times. Matt. xvi. 1—4; Mark viii. 11—13; Luke xii. 54—57. And every one may easily perceive the reason, why he did not allow the disciples, or some others, to say publicly, that he was the Messiah. For considering that the Jewish people in general, and the disciples themselves, expected a worldly kingdom, and worldly advantages from the Messiah; there needed some discretion, lest men should have been led to make tumults and disturbances, which might have been offensive to the magistrate. But when our Lord spoke of himself, as the Messiah, he always inculcated the true design of his coming, and gave assurances of spiritual and heavenly blessings, and such only.

Our Lord still continues at Jerusalem. Ch. ix. 1—41, is the history of the man blind from his birth, whom our Lord healed, anointing his eyes with clay, moistened with his spittle. "And it was the sabbath-day, when Jesus made the clay, and opened his eyes." The man being brought before the pharisees, and examined by them, said, that he who had opened his eyes was a prophet. "And they cast him out. Jesus heard that they had cast him out. And when he had found him, he said unto him: Dost thou believe on the Son of God? He answered, and said: Who is he, Lord, that I might believe on him? Jesus said unto him: Thou hast both seen him, and it is he that talketh with thee. And he said: Lord, I believe, and he worshipped him." All this needs no comment. Afterwards, at ver. 39—41, are intimations given to the pharisees of the sad consequences of rejecting him. And indeed in this history the bad temper of the Jewish rulers is very manifest.

Ch. x. Our Lord speaks of himself as "the true shepherd," or the Messiah. Ver. 11, "I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep." Ver. 16, "And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold." Ver. 22—24, "And it was at Jerusalem the feast of the dedication, and it was winter. And Jesus walked in the temple in Solomon's porch. Then came the Jews round about him, and said unto him: how long dost thou make us to doubt! If thou be the Christ, tell us plainly? Jesus answered them: I told you, and ye believed not. The works that I do in my Father's name bear witness of me." A very proper answer, certainly. And what follows to ver. 38, deserves to be consulted.

Ch. x. 39—42, "Therefore they sought again to take him, but he escaped out of their hand, and went away beyond Jordan, unto the place where John at first baptized: and there he abode. And many resorted unto him, and said: John did no miracles: but all things, that John spake of this man, were true. And many believed on him there."

I suppose this retreat of our Lord to a place beyond Jordan, to be the same that is mentioned, Matt. xix. 1, and Mark x. 1, upon which some remarks were made[t] many years ago. What passed during that interval in that country, is recorded, Matt. xix. to xx. 16, and Mark x. 1—31. Nor was St. Luke unacquainted with this retreat. For he has inserted in his gospel, at ch. xviii. 15—30, some of the same discourses, which are in the other two evangelists, whilst our Lord was there: I say, I suppose that St. John and the other evangelists speak of one and the same recess. But St. John seems to mention more particularly the occasion of it, in the verses just recited.

In this place and interval, our Lord lived somewhat more privately than he had done before. He received all who came to him, either for instruction, or to be healed by him. But he did not go about the cities and villages of Judea, preaching publicly, as he had done for some while before.

I always supposed, that our Lord's living thus, in that place, at no great distance from Jerusalem, had in it a kind design. He intended thereby to afford to the Jewish people, especially their priests and rulers at Jerusalem, an opportunity to consider, and calmly reflect upon all the wonderful things that had happened among them in the space of a few years, the preaching and baptism of John, and all the things said and done by himself in the course of his minis-

[t] See the Vindication of our Saviour's three Miracles of raising the dead, in Vol. x. of this work.

try; particularly, the miracles which he had wrought among them, the claims which he had made of being the promised Messiah whom all ought to receive, and the intimations that had been given of impending ruin and misery.

Here our Lord waited, willing to rest the proof of his mission upon the testimonies that had been given to it. And if the rulers of the Jewish people had now come, and solemnly owned him in the character he bore, and with which God had clothed him, how joyfully would they have been received? But they were not so disposed. Great multitudes of the people came to him there, and "he healed them:" The "pharisees also came unto him:" but it was "tempting him," Matth. xix. 1, 2, 3; Mark x. 1, 2.

But beside what is recorded by the other evangelists, St. John assures us, that in this interval our Lord came to Bethany, about fifteen furlongs, or two miles, from Jerusalem, and there raised Lazarus to life, ch. xi. 1—44. "Then many of the Jews, which came to Mary, and had seen the things which Jesus did, believed on him:" that is, that he was the Christ. "But some of them went their way to the pharisees, and told them what things Jesus had done," ver. 45, 46. "Then gathered they a council.——Then from that day forth, they took counsel together, for to put him to death," ver. 47—53. This shows, that they were inflexible, and not to be gained by any considerations. It follows in ver. 54, "Jesus therefore walked no more openly among the Jews: but went thence into a country near the wilderness, into a city called Ephraim, and there continued with his disciples." Which,[u] I suppose, was not far from the place from which our Lord came last. And from this city, called Ephraim, our Lord came to Bethany again, by the way of Jericho, a short time before the next passover, as related by the other evangelists. We proceed.

Says St. John, ch. xi. 55—57, "And the Jews' passover was nigh at hand.——Now both the chief priests and the pharisees had given a commandment, that if any knew where he was, he should show it, that they might take him." That is a proof of a determined purpose to accomplish their evil designs against Jesus.

The whole following xiith chapter of this gospel deserves attentive regard. I must transcribe a part, though it adds to the length of these extracts. "Then Jesus, six days before the passover, came to Bethany, where Lazarus was, who had been dead, whom he raised from the dead," ch. xii. 1.

[u] Vid. Reland. Palæst. l. i. cap. 56. tom. I. p. 377. et L'Enfant sur S. Jean ch. xi. ver. 54.

"Much people of the Jews therefore knew that he was there. And they came, not for Jesus' sake only, but that they might see Lazarus also, whom he had raised from the dead. But the chief priests consulted, that they might put Lazarus also to death: because that by reason of him many of the Jews went away, and believed on Jesus," ver. 9—11. And here is an account of some Greeks, or Gentiles, who were desirous to see Jesus, ver. 20—22. Whose readiness, accompanied with humility, may be reasonably understood to cast a reflection upon the pride and obstinacy of those, who were unmoved by the most powerful arguments, and the most gracious invitations. The remainder of that chapter, from ver. 35 to 50, is a most proper conclusion of this part of the gospel, in which are these things very observable. "Then Jesus said unto them: Yet a little while the light is with you; walk while ye have the light, lest darkness come upon you——While ye have the light, believe in the light, that ye may be the children of light.——But though he had done so many miracles before them, yet they believed not on him: that the saying of Esaias might be fulfilled.——Jesus cried, and said: He that believeth on me, believeth not on me, but on him that sent me. I am come a light into the world, that whosoever believeth on me, should not abide in darkness.——I have not spoken of myself, but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment what I should speak. And I know that his commandment is life everlasting. Whatsoever I speak, therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak."

Then in the xiii. xiv. xv. xvi. and xviith chapters our Lord instructs and comforts, prays with and for, his disciples; showing[v] tokens of the tenderest affection, and the most faithful concern for those, who had paid a due regard to the evidences of his mission, and adhered to him under difficulties and discouragements. So begins the next, that is, the thirteenth chapter: "Now before the feast of the passover, when Jesus knew that his hour was come, that he should depart out of the world unto the Father; having loved his own, which were in the world, he loved them unto the end."

And indeed it was very natural for the evangelist, who had largely shown the unreasonableness, and the aggravated

[v] Sicut vero hactenus severitatem Domini in Judæos defendit evangelista, ita in sequentibus a capite xiii. ad finem usque fidelitatem Christi illibatam, quam discipulis suis addixit, ex ultimis verbis adserit. Hæc intentio haud obscure addiscitur ex novâ, quæ alteri hujus evangelii parti prefigitur præfatiunculâ, cap. xiii. 1.——Lamp. Prol. l. 2. c. 4. num. xxxvi.

guilt of the Jews, who did not believe in Jesus, but rejected him, to give also a particular account of our Lord's kind acceptance of those who believed in him, and persevered in their faith. So that the design of showing how inexcusable the Jewish people were, in rejecting Jesus, and of vindicating Divine Providence in the calamities brought upon them, is what produced the whole order and economy of this gospel.

The two following chapters, the xviiith and xixth, contain the account of our Lord's prosecution, condemnation, death, and interment. In the two last chapters, the xxth and the xxist, are the accounts of our Lord's resurrection, and the evidences of it, with many tokens of kind regard for his disciples, who had followed him in the time of his abode on this earth, and were now to be his witnesses in the world, and to preach, under many difficulties, the same doctrine which he had taught.

There is another thing, which may induce us to think, that one great design of St. John in writing his gospel, was to show the unreasonableness, and the great guilt of the Jews, in rejecting Jesus: that in his gospel are inserted more instances of their attempts upon our Lord's life, than in the other gospels. Some such things there are in them. Accounts of the pharisees' consulting how they might destroy Jesus, may be seen in Matt. xii. 14; Mark iii. 6; Luke vi. 11; beside their last attempt, when they were permitted to accomplish their evil design. But there are more such instances in St. John's, than in any of the other gospels. As John vii. 1, "After these things Jesus walked in Galilee. For he would not walk in Judea, because the Jews sought to kill him." However, he came up to Jerusalem at the next feast of tabernacles, ver. 2. And their designs were renewed. Ch. vii. 25, "Then said some of them at Jerusalem: Is not this he, whom they seek to kill?"—Ver. 31, 32, "And many of the people believed on him, and said: When the Christ cometh, will he do more miracles than these, which this man has done? The pharisees heard that they murmured such things concerning him: and the pharisees and chief priests sent officers to take him." But the officers, overcome by the excellence of his discourses, could not persuade themselves to apprehend him: for which they were reproached by the council in a most outrageous manner; but Nicodemus strove to allay their resentment; ver. 45—52. And ch. viii. 20, "These words spake Jesus, in the treasury, as he taught in the temple: and no man laid hands on him, because his time was not yet come." Ver. 37,

"I know, that ye are Abraham's seed: but ye seek to kill me, a man who has told you the truth, which I have heard of God. This did not Abraham." Ver. 59, "Then took they up stones to cast at him."—And ch. x. 39, 40, "Therefore they sought again to take him: but he escaped out of their hand, and went away beyond Jordan." And when our Lord proposed to go to Bethany, upon occasion of the sickness and death of Lazarus, the disciples go unwillingly, and would have dissuaded him from that journey, being apprehensive of the imminent danger therein both to him and themselves, ch. xi. 7—16. See likewise ver. 45—57. All these are things quite omitted by the other evangelists. As is also what is said, ch. xii. 10, 11. And in their last persecution of Jesus before Pilate there are some very aggravating particulars mentioned by St. John, which the other evangelists have not taken notice of. See ch. xviii. 29—32; ch. xix. 1—15.

Our blessed Lord, preparing his disciples for afflictions, reconciling their minds to them, and encouraging them to endure them patiently, says, ch. xv. 21—24, "All these things will they do unto you for my name's sake, because they know not him that sent me. If I had not come, and spoken unto them, they had not had sin: but now they have no excuse for their sin. He that hateth me, hateth my Father also. If I had not done among them the works which no other man did, they had not had sin: but now have they both seen and hated both me and my Father." That is a strong, but just and true representation of the heinousness of the guilt of the Jewish people. For which reason I could not forbear to allege it here, though it should be thought out of place.

And now having, as I suppose, shown this design of the evangelist, let me mention an observation or two, by way of corollary.

First. We see the reason of St. John's recording the miracle of raising Lazarus, omitted by the other evangelists. There was no necessity that they should mention it: for without it they have recorded sufficient evidences of our Lord's mission and character. Nor was it possible, without an improper prolixity, to record all our Saviour's discourses and miracles, as St. John himself has observed. Moreover the first three evangelists have chiefly insisted upon the most public part of our Lord's ministry: for which reason this miracle did not come so directly in their way. But St. John could not omit it. His design necessarily led him to relate this great miracle done so near Jerusalem, and with

all its circumstances. For it manifestly shows the perverse and incorrigible temper of the Jewish priests and rulers.

Secondly. None ought any more to make a question, whether our Lord twice cleansed the temple, or once only. It was cleansed by him at the time of his last passover, as related by the first three evangelists. But it was very proper for St. John to record that done at the first passover of our Lord's ministry: it affording an alarming evidence of his being the expected Messiah, which should have been taken notice of by the Jewish rulers at Jerusalem. It was an early and open claim of the character of the Messiah. And their neglecting that, and so many other claims and evidences of the same great truth afterwards, manifests the obstinacy of their unbelief: which was fitly shown by this evangelist.

I now proceed to some other arguments.

3. One argument, that St. John's gospel was written before the destruction of Jerusalem, is taken from ch. v. 2, "Now there is at Jerusalem, by the sheep-market," or sheep gate, "a pool, which is called in the Hebrew tongue Bethesda, having five porches."

On this passage insist both[w] Basnage and [x] Lampe. St. John does not say, as they observe, there was, but there is. And though the pool might remain, it could not be said after the ruin of the city, that the five porches still subsisted.

Mr. Whiston argues in this manner. 'St. John's[y] speaking of the pool of Bethesda in the present tense, better agrees to the time here assigned, A. D. 63, before the destruction of Jerusalem, when that pool and porch were certainly in being, than to the time afterwards, when probably both were destroyed.'

Dr. Whitby likewise was somewhat affected by this text, and says: 'If "there is" be the true reading, as the consent of almost all the Greek copies argues, it seems to in-

[w] Porro quod tam sero scriptum Joannis evangelium tradamus, id ex sententiâ potius veterum, quam ex rei veritate, fecimus. Ex ipso quippe evangelio nascitur argumentum ad existimandum, lucem prius aspexisse, quam Hierosolyma everteretur. 'Est,' inquit, 'Hierosolymis ad portam ovium piscina.' Stetisse ergo videtur urbs sancta, Joanne ea verba scribente. Secus, non præsens, est, ἐστι, sed præteritum adhibuisset. Basn. an. 97. n. xii.

[x] Habetur igitur hic non tantum mentio 'portæ ovium,' tanquam tunc adhuc exstantis, cum scriberet evangelista, sed etiam ædificii ex quinque porticibus constantis, quales structuræ post dirutam a Romanis Hierosolymam illic frustra essent quæsitæ. Licet enim piscinam superesse velint itineraria, portæ tamen ac muri solo æquata erant. Inde igitur colligimus, stetisse urbem sanctam, Joanne ea verba scribente. Secus, non præsens, est, sed præteritum adhibuisset. Lamp. Prol. l. 2. cap. 2. num. xi.

[y] Essay on the Constitutions, ch. i. p. 38.

'timate, that Jerusalem and this pool were standing when 'St. John wrote his gospel: and therefore, that it was writ-'ten, as Theophylact and others say, before the destruction 'of Jerusalem, and not, as the more ancient fathers thought, 'long after.'

But Mr. Jones, beside other things, says, 'that[z] in all 'probability the pool was not filled up, but was still in 'the same state, after the destruction of Jerusalem, as be-'fore.' To which, however, it might be answered, that supposing the pool not to have been filled up, it would not be reasonable to think, that the porches and the gate still subsisted, after the destruction of the city. But then Mr. Jones adds: 'Supposing the pool was destroyed, and St. John to 'have known it, there is no impropriety in using the verb '"is:" nothing being more common among writers, than to 'use verbs in the present tense, to denote the preterperfect.'

Having represented this argument, as it has appeared to divers learned men, I leave every one to judge of it.

4. In ch. xxi. 18, 19, Christ foretells, that Peter would die by martyrdom. Then it is added: "This spake he, signifying, by what death he should glorify God." Some may hence argue, that[a] Peter was not yet dead when this was written: or that St. John did not then know of it. But others may be of opinion, that[b] though Peter had suffered martyrdom a good while before, and St. John knew it very well; yet he was not obliged to take notice of it, but might write as he does.

Indeed, I am of opinion, that St. John could not take notice of Peter's death. It was not a thing within his province. As an evangelist, he wrote the history of our Saviour, not of his apostles.

5. A like argument may be taken from the following verses, 20, 21, 22, "Peter seeing John, saith to Jesus: Lord, and what shall this man do? Jesus saith unto him: if I will, that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? Follow thou me. Then went this saying abroad, that that disciple should not die. Yet Jesus said not unto him, he shall not die,

[z] New and Full Method, Vol. iii. p. 141.

[a] Post Petri martyrium editum esse Joannis evangelium consensus est patrum omnium. Fit tamen in eâ re scrupulus. Petro Christus mortem diserte portendit, cap. xxi. 18——Quæ si scripta sunt, jam misso ad mortem Petro, injici de eâ re mentio debebat, ut et completi oraculi cognitio caperetur, et martyri Christi laus sua concederetur. Basn. Exercit. p. 384.

[b] Locus ex Joh. xxi. 18, non magni in hac caussâ momenti est. Nullam enim video necessitatem, cur mortem Petri commemoraret, si vel actu notitiam ejus habuisset, quia sic per se satis veritas prædictionis Jesu innotuisset, &c. Lamp. ib. l. 2. c. 2. sect. xiii.

but if I will, that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?" If by Christ's coming be here intended the overthrow of Jerusalem, as many think, it may be supposed reasonable by some to expect, that St. John should have taken some notice of it here, if he wrote after that event. Nevertheless, I humbly apprehend, that this is not an argument of much weight. I do not think, that as an evangelist he was obliged to give an account of the fulfilment of Christ's prediction, though he had been a witness of it.

6. "This is the disciple that testifieth these things, and wrote these things. And we know that his testimony is true." By these last words Mr. Lampe[c] supposed to be meant some Jews, then living in Asia, who were eye-witnesses of our Lord, and his ministry: which might well be, if St. John's gospel was written before the destruction of Jerusalem: but would not be reckoned likely, if it was written not before the year of the vulgar epoch 97, or 98. They who confirm the testimony of another, ought to have the same certain knowledge of the thing testified, as he who speaks, or writes. But after the destruction of Jerusalem, it is not reasonable to think, there were many to bear witness to things done forty or fifty years before. These Jews, eye-witnesses of our Lord, Mr. Lampe supposeth to have been believers of that nation, who accompanied John into Asia, when he left Judea.

I have thought it proper, not to omit this argument of that learned writer: but it depends upon his interpretation of this verse; which is not certain. For some have supposed, that[d] it is the church of Ephesus, which here speaks: and others think it to be [e] St. John himself. The change of number and person, of *we* for *I*, is no valid objection. So 1 John i. 1—5, "That which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes."—3 epist. 12, "Yea, and we also bear record, and ye know that our record is true." And St. Paul, 1 Thess. ii. 18, "Wherefore we would have come unto you, even I Paul, once and again; but Satan hindered us." Chrysostom[f] and Theophylact[g] understood St. John

[c] Ibid. l. 2. cap. 2. num. ix.

[d] 'Et scimus.'] Loquitur ecclesia Ephesina. 'Scimus,' aiunt, 'fide dignum,' ex vitæ scilicet puritate, et miraculis ab eo editis. Grot. in loc.

[e] 'The evangelist had 'said before, ch. xix. 35. "He knoweth, that he says true." Here in this 'place he changeth the person, saying: "We know, that his testimony is 'true."' Lightfoot upon John xxi. 24. Vol. II. p. 627. See likewise Whitby, L'Enfant, and Doddridge upon the place.

[f] *Και οιδα, φησιν, ὁτι αληθη εστιν ἁ λεγει.———Και πασι δε παρην, και ὡδε σταυρομενω απολιμπανετο, και την μητερα ανεχειριθη.* Chrys. hom. 88. al. 87. T. VIII. p. 588. C. D. E.

[g] *Και οιδα, φησιν, ὁτι αληθη λεγει,*

to speak here of himself, as an eye-witness, who had been present at almost every thing related by him in his history.

7. It is said: 'The three epistles of St. John do ever suppose the gospel of St. John to have been written long before, and to be well known by those to whom he wrote. 'And they are written with a constant view and regard to 'the contents of the same gospel.' That is an argument [h] of Mr. Whiston, which, with what he adds by way of confirmation, is referred to the reader's consideration.

8. Some have argued for an early date of this gospel, or at least, that it was written before the Revelation, which was seen in Patmos, because [i] it is said at the beginning of that book, ch. i. 1, 2, "Who bare record of the word of God, and of the testimony of Jesus Christ, and of all things which he saw." They suppose, that therein St. John refers to his gospel, and what he had written in it. But to me the most reasonable account of those words appears to be that which [k] was given formerly: that they are most properly understood of that very book, the Revelation and the things contained in it. The writer there says very pertinently, in his introduction, that in that book he had discharged the office assigned him: having therein faithfully recorded the word of God, received from Jesus Christ, and all the visions which he had seen.

9. Once more it is argued from inscriptions, at the end of this gospel, in divers manuscripts, that it was written before the destruction of Jerusalem: it being there said, that this gospel was written in the time of Nero, at thirty years, or about two and thirty years after our Saviour's ascension. Upon these insisted [l] Mr. Wetstein in a passage quoted from him some while ago. Upon them likewise insists [m] Mr. Lampe.

τετεστι· πληροφορηθεις εγραψα, ἁ εγραψα, ἀτε πασι παρων, και τοις εργοις, και τοις λογοις, και τοις παθεσι, και τοις μετα την ανασασιν. Αγαπητος γαρ ημην, και ουκ απελιμπανομην, ὡστε παῤῥησιαζομαι, και περι εμαυτȣ λεγω, ὁτι αληθευω. Theophyl. in Jo. tom. I. p. 847.

[h] See his Commentary upon St. John's three Catholic Epistles, p. 8, &c.

[i] Ipsum porro audiamus evangelistam idem non obscure, uti nobis videtur, subindicantem, quando Apoc. i. 2. se ita circumscribit, ὁς εμαρτυρησε τον λογον τȣ Θεȣ———Et versu 9.——Plurimi optimi interpretes in eo consentiunt, quod in his verbis ad evangelium respiciatur, licet in modo demonstrandi differant, &c. Lamp. Prol. l. 2. cap. 2. sect. viii.

[k] See Vol. ii. p. 708.

[l] See before, p. 431.

[m] Accedit multarum glossarum et versionum in id consensus, quod sub Nerone evangelium sit exaratum. Licet enim auctoritates hæ sequioris ævi sint, ob earum tamen frequentiam et harmoniam valde est credibile, quod in antiquiori traditione fundatæ sint——Id tamen observavi discrimen, ut quædam numero rotundo xxx. post Christi adscensionem, aliæ xxxii. nominent. Lampe, ibid. l. 2. cap. 2. num. xii. Vid. et num. xiv.

For my own part I lay not any stress at all upon these inscriptions, at the end of Greek, or Arabic, or other manuscripts of the New Testament, written in the ninth or tenth century, or later. They[n] are of no authority: for there is no proof that this account was derived from the testimony or tradition of ancient authors. The early date of the gospels was popular. Some having without reason determined the time of writing the other gospels at eight, or ten, or fifteen years after our Lord's ascension, pitched upon the year 30, or 32, for the time of St. John's gospel: but it was done upon no other ground and foundation, but mere fancy and conjecture.

X. It is upon the two first-mentioned arguments that I chiefly rely. However, there are objections, which deserve to be considered.

1. Obj. Chrysostom was of opinion, that St. John did not write till after the destruction of Jerusalem. For in a homily upon Matt. xxiv. he says, 'John[o] writes not of any 'of these things, lest it should be thought, that he took an 'advantage from the event. For he was living a good while 'after the destruction of Jerusalem. But the other evange-'lists, who died before the destruction of Jerusalem, and 'saw none of those things, record these predictions.'

To which I answer, that St. John's omitting our Saviour's predictions concerning the destruction of Jerusalem, which are recorded by the other evangelists, is no proof that he did not write until after they were fulfilled. For if he wrote at the time supposed by us, when that event was near, it is very likely, that he would omit these predictions: especially, having observed, that they were sufficiently recorded already. And we plainly see, that it is not St. John's method to repeat what had been recorded before. However, he has inserted in his gospel divers expressions, containing warnings and intimations of the miseries coming upon the Jewish people, if they did not receive the Lord Jesus as the Messiah. John the Baptist may be supposed to intend this in words recorded, John iii. 36. Our Lord intimates it in his discourse with Nicodemus, ch. iii. 18, 19, and upon divers other occasions, already taken notice of by us in this gospel, ch. viii. 12, 21, 24; ch. ix. 39—41; ch. xii. 35, 36.

2. Obj. Mr. Whiston, in[p] his Short View of the Harmony

[n] Neque ordo, qui nunc receptus est epistolarum, sequitur ordinem temporis, neque antiqua sunt illa, quæ sub finem sunt addita, ad significandum, unde et per quos missæ sunt.——et illæ in fine annotatiunculæ seræ sunt, ex conjecturâ, aut tenui famâ. Grot. Comm. in loca quædam N. T. sub in. tom. III. p. 457. [o] See Vol. iv. p. 543. [p] P. 115, 116.

of the evangelists, says, ‘ that St. John useth the Roman or ‘ Julian beginning of the day in his gospel, the same that we ‘ use at present, and reckons the hours from midnight and ‘ noon. He refers to John i. 39; xix. 14, and xx. 19. Which ‘ he reckons an argument, that St. John wrote his gospel ‘ long after the destruction of Jerusalem, and the period of ‘ the Jewish polity at Ephesus, a place remote from Judea, ‘ and under the Roman government.’

To which I answer, 1. It does not appear to me, that St. John computes the hours of the day after the Roman, but rather after the Jewish manner. 2. Supposing St. John to have used the Roman method of computation, it does not follow, that he wrote after the destruction of Jerusalem, and the period of the Jewish polity. We allow, that St. John's gospel was written at Ephesus, at a distance from Judea. And, if he thought fit, he might use the Roman way of reckoning, especially, when the period of the Jewish commonwealth was near, though not quite accomplished.

Thus I have endeavoured to solve this objection. What was Mr. Whiston's own solution, I do not know: but I suppose, that he afterwards overcame this difficulty. For in his later writings he maintains a very different sentiment concerning the date of St. John's gospel, pleading, that it was written about the year of Christ 63, a good while before the destruction of Jerusalem. So he argues in his Essay upon the Apostolical Constitutions, published in 1711, and in his Commentary upon St. John's Epistles, published in 1719. His Harmony of the four Evangelists was printed at Cambridge in the year 1702.

3. Obj. It is farther objected, that many ancient writers speak of a late date of St. John's gospel, and that he wrote with a design to confute divers heretics: who cannot be supposed to have appeared till after the destruction of Jerusalem, and the overthrow of the Jewish people.

To which I answer, that this may have been owing to a mistaken apprehension. Many heretics, they saw, might be confuted by St. John's gospel. Therefore they concluded, that he did not write till after they had appeared in the world: whilst the truth might be no more than this, that such and such heretics might be confuted out of his gospel: though they had not appeared in the world till long after. Paulinus says, ‘ that[q] in the beginning of St. John's gospel ‘ all heretics are confuted, particularly Arius, Sabellius, ‘ Photinus, Marcion, and the Manichees.’ And in Mr. Wetstein's preface to St. John's gospel, written not long ago, in

[q] Vol. iv. ch. cxxiv.

our time, are these expressions. Having before quoted Irenæus, he adds, 'Which[r] if they be compared with those 'things, which Carpocrates, Menander, Cerdo, Saturninus, 'Basilides, Valentinus, and Marcion, have said of angels 'and æons: among whom were Charis *grace*, Alethea *truth*, 'Monogenes *only-begotten*, Logos *word*, Zoe *life*: it must 'be manifest, that John so opposed his doctrine to them, as 'to use the forms of expression received by them.' Surely, this is very incautious and inaccurate. Must it not be so to say, that St. John opposed those heretics, most of which are heretics of the second century? If St. John's gospel be genuine, it must have been written before the end of the first century. Yea, Mr. Wetstein says, it was written at about two and thirty years after Christ's ascension. How then could St. John oppose them, or write against them, but in the way of prophecy or prevention? But to say, he opposed his doctrine to them, or wrote against them, does not seem very proper. And if the ancient writers speak not more accurately than this learned modern, an argument taken from them, upon this head, cannot be of much weight.

It is the testimony of Irenæus, which ought principally to be regarded by us upon account of his antiquity, and his having been acquainted with Polycarp in the early part of his life. He says, as before transcribed, 'that by the publi-'cation of his gospel John designed to root out the error 'that had been sown among men by Cerinthus.' But it is observable, that in another place, also transcribed above, he says: 'John foreseeing those blasphemous notions that di-'vide the Lord, so far as it is in their power,' wrote his gospel. For this passage I am indebted to Mr. Whiston, who argues, that St. John's gospel was written about the year 63, and before this apostle's three epistles. 'Nor,' says[s] he, 'shall I need to support this observation from any 'other argument, than that from Irenæus, who supposeth 'this gospel, and St. Paul's epistle to the Romans, ancient-'er, and these epistles later, than the rise of the heresy of 'Cerinthus:' referring to the passage of Irenæus, before taken notice of by us.

If then we put together the several passages of Irenæus, he does not contradict the supposition of an early date of

[r] Quæ si comparentur cum iis, quæ Carpocrates, Menander, Cerdo, Saturninus, Basilides, Valentinus, et Marcion de angelis et æonibus, inter quos erant Charis, Alethea, Monogenes, Logos, Zoë, item de Christo, non vere, sed δοκησει passo, tradiderunt; satis manifestum erit, Joannem doctrinam suam illis ita opponere, ut loquendi formulis apud illos receptis utatur. Wetst. Test. Gr. tom. I. p. 832.

[s] Commentary upon St. John's Epistles, p. 8.

St. John's gospel: or, that it was written before the rise of those heresies, which may be confuted by it.

It may be judged presumptuous to oppose the prevailing opinion of learned men, who have supposed that some heretics were particularly struck at in the beginning of this gospel. Nevertheless Mr. Lampe,[t] whom I have often quoted, has presumed to oppose this opinion, and has largely argued, that St. John did not write against Cerinthus, or other heretics in his gospel. And though another learned German[u] has since written against Mr. Lampe, I cannot say that he has confuted him.

I shall therefore take the liberty to mention some thoughts relating to this matter, which offer themselves to my mind.

First: To me it seems below an evangelist to write against heretics in the history of his Lord and Master. Nor do any of the evangelists enter into a particular account of things after our Lord's ascension. St. John proceeds no farther than his resurrection, and the evidences of it, without particularly mentioning his ascension: nor has St. Matthew proceeded any farther. However, undoubtedly, it is implied in what they write, that our Lord was raised up to an endless life, and to universal power in heaven and on earth. St. Mark, ch. xvi. 19, and St. Luke, xxiv. 50,51, relate our Saviour's ascension to heaven.

This has oftentimes appeared to me exceeding remarkable, that none of the evangelists should in their gospels give an account of the preaching of the apostles after our Lord's ascension, and the descent of the Holy Ghost upon them. Take the earliest date of the gospels that can be thought of, or assigned by any; all must allow, that before any of them were written, many miracles had been performed by the apostles, and many converts must have been made from among Jews, if not also from among Gentiles; and many promises of our Lord must have been accomplished: and we can perceive from their gospels, that they had a knowledge of such things; nevertheless there is no particular ac-

[t] Nos ut, salvâ, quam viris magnis—debemus, existimatione, libere animi sensa proferamus, an evangelio suo Joannes controversiam tractare, hærcticosque in ecclesiâ sui ævi ullos refutare voluerit, dubitamus admodum. Neque enim id titulus generalis evangelii libro præfixus admittit, neque id commode per librum ad methodum historiæ compositum fieri potuit, neque illius rei vel vola vel vestigium ullum apparet: quod tamen et scriptoribus elencticis in more constanti positum est, et e re admodum erat, ut eo certius tela ferirent, et eo evidentius argumentorum patesceret robur. Lampe, Prolegom. in Joann. l. 2. cap. iii. num. xiii. Vid. ib. num. xiv. xv. xvi. et seq.

[u] G. L. Œderus de scopo evangelii S. Jo. Ap. certissime hæresi Cerinthi et Ebionis oppositi. Adversus V. C. Fr. Ad. Lampe. Lipsiæ. 1732.

count of them in any of the gospels. St. Mark is the only evangelist that has said any thing in his gospel of the ministry of the apostles; and he enters not into any detail: his whole account is in a few words only, the last verse of his gospel.

Considering this method of all the evangelists in their histories of our Lord and Saviour, it appears to me probable, that though St. John had not written his gospel before the year 96, or 97, as some have supposed; he would not have taken notice of heretics, or vouchsafed to argue with them. St. John did not write the history of the apostles, as is evident: how then could he take notice of heretics.

Secondly: Another thing of no small moment is this. I see nothing of this kind in the rest of St. John's gospel. Why [v] then should we imagine that there is any such thing in the introduction? If St. John's gospel is not written against heretics, why should the beginning of it be so? What St. John says in the introduction, appears to me agreeable to the main design of his gospel, as it has been before largely represented. He therein shows, that Jesus came and acted by the authority of God, the Creator of the world, the God, and supreme lawgiver of the Jewish people. The [w] eternal word, reason, wisdom, power of God, which is God himself, by which the world had been made, by which he dwelled among the Jews in the tabernacle, and the temple, [x] dwelled and resided in Jesus in the fullest manner: so [y] that we his disciples, and others who believed

[v] Ex quibus clare, ut putamus, patet, in prologo compendium contineri rerum, quas evangelista toto evangelio demonstrare volebat, nempe Jesum non tantum esse Filium Dei et redemtorem mundi, [ver. 1—4.] sed etiam, quâ talem, ita plene in mundo demonstratum esse, ut ab unâ parte Judæi plane redditi fuerint *αναπολογητοι* [ver. 4—11.] ab alterâ autem fideles sufficiens fidei firmamentum acceperint, ver. 12—18. Lamp. Prol. l. 2. cap. 4. num. xxv.

[w] Quæris veram hujus nominis interpretationem, de quâ variæ exstant eruditorum virorum sententiæ? Non vindico mihi ejus rei arbitrium: tantum, quod hic sentio, modeste, salvâ dissentientium existimatione et amicitiâ, profero. Vertendum esse hoc nomen Ratio, vel Sapientia Dei: etsi receptam phrasim Sermonis Dei, in versione retinendam censuerim.———Constat cuique, prologum evangelii legenti, alludere Joannem in toto illo prologo—ad caput octavum Proverbiorum Salomonis,—ut proinde talem eligere oporteat interpretationem, quæ affinis sit voci Sapientiæ. Vitring. in Apoc. cap. xix. ver. 13. p. 1109.

[x] Ut celebratissimo loco legitur: *Και ὁ λογος σαρξ εγενετο·* quod recte redditur: Et Verbum, sive sermo, homo factus est, sive humanam naturam induit. Et *εξ εργων νομε ʒ δικαιωθησεται πασα σαρξ·* i. e. homo quisquam, Rom. iii. 20. ut Ps. cxliv. 22. al. cxlv. 21. *και ευλογειτω πασα σαρξ το ονομα αυτʒ.* Pearson. Prolegom. ad Version. lxx. Cantab. p. 13.

[y] 'We saw his glory, as what became the only-'begotten Son of God. He did not glitter in any worldly pomp and grandeur, 'according to what the Jewish nation fondly dreamed their Messiah would do:

in him, saw, and clearly discerned him to be the promised Messiah, the great prophet that should come into the world.

The apostles, in their addresses to the Jewish people, never fail to give assurances, that Jesus Christ had acted by the authority of the one true God, the God of their ancestors. So Acts ii. 22, "Ye men of Israel, hear these words. Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles——which God did by him in the midst of you." And ch. iii. 13, "The God of Abraham, of Isaac, and Jacob, the God of our fathers has glorified his Son Jesus."——See also ver. 22—26. Ch. v. 30, "The God of our Fathers has raised up Jesus."——The epistle to the Hebrews begins in this manner: "God, who at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son."

Indeed this is necessary for the satisfaction of all men, both Jews and Gentiles; for there is no other God but one, even the God of the patriarchs and prophets: nor can any true revelation come from any but him.

In all the gospels our Lord ascribes all his miracles, and all his authority, to the one God, "his Father who is in heaven." Matt. xii. 28, "If I cast out dæmons by the Spirit of God, then is the kingdom of God come unto you." Luke xi. 20, "If I by the finger of God cast out dæmons, no doubt the kingdom of God is come unto you." Matt. xi. 27, "All things are delivered unto me by my Father."—— Compare Luke x. 22. Matt. xv. 13, "Every plant, which my heavenly Father has not planted, shall be rooted up." Matt. xvi. 27, "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father."——Comp. Mark viii. 38. And the like in many other places.

But in none of the gospels does our Lord so frequently and expressly ascribe all his authority to God the Father, as in St. John's gospel: thereby plainly showing the guilt of those who did not receive him. John v. 19, "The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do." ——Ver. 30, "I seek not my own will, but the will of the Father who hath sent me." Ver. 36, 37, "But I have greater witness than that of John. For the works which the Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do, bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me."—— Ver. 43, "I am come in my Father's name, and ye receive me not."——And at ver. 45—47, our Lord appeals to Moses and his writings, which were allowed to be of divine

'but he was decked with the glory of holiness, grace, truth, and the power of 'miracles.' Lightfoot's Exercitations upon St. John, vol. II. p. 521.

original, as bearing testimony to him. Then ch. vi. 27,—— "Him hath God the Father sealed." Ch. vii. 16, "I am not alone. But I, and the Father, that sent me." Ch. x. 36, "Say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world: thou blasphemest: because I said, I am the Son of God?" And to add no more, ch. xi. 41, 42, when he wrought that great miracle of raising Lazarus from the dead, "Jesus lift up his eyes and said, Father, I thank thee, that thou hast heard me: and I knew that thou hearest me always; but because of the people which stand by, I said it, that they may believe that thou hast sent me."

Agreeable to all this is the introduction, where, beside other, are these expressions: "He came to his own, and his own received him not.——The word was made flesh, and dwelled among us——And we saw his glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father.——The law was given by Moses; but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ. No man hath seen God at any time, the only-begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he has declared him." So ends the introduction. And it is what St. John has largely and fully shown in his gospel.

But it will be asked: whence came it to pass, that St. John made use of that term, "the Word?"

I answer: I am of opinion, that it was not out of regard to Philo, or any Platonic writers. But I suppose, this[z] way of speaking to have been very common with the Jewish people, and, perhaps, more especially with those of them who were most zealous for the law, and most exempt from foreign, and philosophical speculations. Who by "the Word," or "the Word of God," understood, not a spirit separate from God, and inferior to him, but God himself, as St. John[a] does.

[z] Plerique observant, similem locutionem frequenter occurrere in Paraphrasibus Chaldaïcis, quæ veterum Hebræorum catechesin, et antiquas loquendi formulas, exhibent. Quoties de Deo nobiscum conversante sermo est, toties vero Targumistæ, pro Deo, vel Jehovâ, substituerunt *verbum Jehovæ*. Pro exemplo hæc paucula ex innumeris sunto. Gen. xxi. 20, Deus fuit cum illo. Onkelos. Verbum Domini fuit illi auxilio. Ib. comm. 22. Deus est tecum. Onkelos. Verbum Domini enim tibi subsidio. Deut. xx. 1, Ne timeto ab eis. Nam Deus tuus tecum est. Onkelos.—eo quod Jehova Deus tuus, Verbum ejus auxilio tibi est, quod eduxit te ex terrâ Ægypti. Num. xi. 20, Eo quod reprobâsti Jehovam. Onkelos. Eo quod fastidîstis Verbum Domini, cujus Shechinah (Divina Majestas) habitat in vobis. Exod. xvi. 8, Non contra nos murmurationes vestræ, sed contra Jehovam. Onkelos.—sed contra Verbum Jevæ. Infinita sunt similia. Unde colligitur, receptum eo tempore Hebræis fuisse, ut Deum, quâtenus cum populo suo agit, Verbum vocaverint: cui ea attribuerunt, quæ Dei sunt. Wits. Miscell. Sacr. tom. ii. p. 88, 89. Exercita. iii. περι τȣ λογȣ. sect. ii.

[a] Omnia igitur talia conscribere volens discipulus Domini, et regulam veritatis constituere in ecclesiâ quia est unus Deus Omnipotens, qui per Verbum suum omnia fecit, et visibilia et

Numb. xxiii. 8, " How shall I curse whom God has not cursed? or, how shall I defy whom the Lord has not defied?" Upon which verse Patrick says, ' In the Jerusalem ' Targum this verse is thus paraphrased: " How shall I ' curse the house of Israel, when the Word of the Lord has ' blessed them? Or, how shall I diminish the family of Is- ' rael, when the Word of the Lord has multiplied them?"

It is well known, that in the Chaldee paraphrases, it is very common to put Mimra Jehovah, the Word of the Lord, for Jehovah, or God. When those paraphrases were made, is not certain; whether before, or after the time of our Saviour: but their great antiquity is generally allowed. And it is very probable, that this way of speaking was common, and much used before. ' It is likely,' says a learned friend, ' that Mimra Jehovah was used before the paraphrases ' were committed to writing, because it would be an unrea- ' sonable thing to use a phrase, which the common people ' did not understand: for it is supposed, that the paraphrases ' were chiefly made for them.'

Let me add, that the use of this phrase, " the Word of God," or " the Word of the Lord," as equivalent to God himself, seems to be founded in the original language of the Old Testament. In behalf of which I would allege the following texts. Gen. i. 1, " In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." Ver. 3, " God said: let there be light. And there was light." Comp. Ps. xxxiii. 6, " By the Word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth." And Ps. cv. 19, " Until the time that this word came: the Word of the Lord tried him."

When St. John says, ch. i. 1, 2, 3, " In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made," he seems to allude to[b] what Solomon says of wisdom in the book of Proverbs, particu-

invisibilia; significans quoque, quoniam per Verbum, per quod Deus perfecit conditionem, in hoc et salutem his qui in conditione sunt, præstitit hominibus; sic inchoavit in eâ, quæ est secundum evangelium, doctrinâ; In principio erat Verbum. Iren. l. 3. cap. xi. in Massuet.

Et Cerinthus autem quidam in Asiâ, non a primo Deo factum esse mundum docuit, sed a Virtute quâdam valde separatâ et distante ab eâ Principalitate, quæ est super omnia. Id. l. 1. cap. xxv. al. 26. in.

Deus autem, totus existens mens, et totus existens logos, quod cogitat, hoc et loquitur; et quod loquitur, id et cogitat. Cogitatio enim ejus logos, et logos mens, et omnia concludens mens, ipse et Pater. Id. l. 2. cap. xxviii. n. 5. p. 57.

[b] See the passage of Vitringa quoted just now, at note [w] p. 452.

larly, the eighth chapter. And how wisdom ought to be understood as spoken of by Solomon, is shown, if I may be allowed to say so, in[c] a discourse upon Prov. viii. 17. Moreover the beginning of St. John's gospel should be compared with the beginning of his first epistle, particularly ch. i. 1, 2.

According to the account now given, what St. John says at the beginning, is a very proper introduction to his gospel: where he largely shows the guilt of those, who rejected the manifestation[d] of the wisdom, the word, the will of God, in the person of Jesus.

Upon the whole, I see no reason to think, that, in the introduction to his gospel, St. John opposed any christian heresies, or had any regard to them.

Consequently, the foregoing argument, that St. John's gospel was written before the destruction of Jerusalem, or about the time of that event, remains entire.

XI. I shall now mention some observations upon this gospel.

1. There is no need to show here, particularly, from the gospel itself, as we did of the former evangelists, that St. John did not write his gospel till after converts had been made from among Gentiles: because it is allowed by all, that St. John did not write till after the other evangelists, about the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, or afterwards: before which time the apostles must have left Judea, to go abroad, and preach to Gentiles. Nevertheless one signal passage may be here taken notice of, which is not far from the beginning of this gospel. Ch. i. 11, 12, 13, "He came to his own, and his own received him not: but as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name. Which were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." That is, 'he came to the Jews, 'and first appeared and taught among them, and they ge-'nerally rejected him. But upon all who believed in him, 'whether Jews or Gentiles, of whatever country, or nation, 'or people they were, he bestowed the privilege of being 'the people of God, and all the blessings appertaining to 'them.'

2. Eusebius says, 'The[e] other three evangelists have re-'corded the actions of our Saviour for one year only, after 'the imprisonment of John the Baptist.' Jerom speaks to the like purpose in his book of Illustrious Men, just

[c] See Vol. ix. p. 164, 165.

[d] See Vol. iv. p. 95, 96.

[e] See Vol. iv. p. 95.

now[f] transcribed. But it should have been said, 'one year, 'and somewhat more:' meaning the time and actions of our Lord's most public ministry. For it seems to me, that the ancients supposed our Lord's ministry to have lasted, in the whole, somewhat more than two years; as was shown, Vol. ii. p. 448, 449. Eusebius indeed computed our Lord's ministry to have consisted of three years and a half, and supposed St. John's gospel to have in it four passovers. He seems to have been the first christian who advanced that opinion: and he is now generally followed by harmonizers of the gospels, and by ecclesiastical historians. Sir Isaac Newton[g] however computes five passovers in our Saviour's ministry; as does likewise Dr. Edward Wells in his Historical Geography of the New Testament. And others may be of the same opinion, or make more. But none of these opinions appear to me to have any foundation in the gospels. The opinion of Eusebius, and those who follow him, is much more probable, than theirs who yet farther enlarge the number of the passovers of our Saviour's ministry. The first passover in St. John is that mentioned by him, ch. ii. 13. At ch. v. 1, it is said: "After this there was a feast of the Jews, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem." They who follow Eusebius, and make four passovers in our Lord's ministry, reckon this feast to be a passover. But they who compute his ministry to have lasted only two years, and somewhat more, suppose this to be some other feast, possibly, the feast of tabernacles, next succeeding the passover, mentioned, ch. ii. 13. At ch. vi. 4, "And the passover, a feast of the Jews, was nigh:" this, according to different computations, is either the second, or the third passover in our Lord's ministry. The third, or, according to others, the fourth, is that mentioned by all the evangelists, at which our Lord suffered. It is mentioned by St. John, ch. xi. 55. and xii. 1.

3. St. John has omitted the greatest part of those things which are recorded by the other evangelists: which much confirms the testimony of ancient writers, that the first three gospels were written and published among the faithful before St. John wrote; that they were brought to him, and that he affirmed the truth of their relations, but said, that some discourses and miracles of our Saviour were omitted by them, which might be usefully recorded.

Indeed, there is little or nothing in his gospel, which is not new and additional, except the account of our Saviour's prosecution, death, and resurrection, where all four coincide

[f] See before, p. 429. [g] Observations upon Daniel, p. 156, 157.

in many particulars: though even here also St. John has divers things peculiar to himself. In St. John's gospel is no account of our Saviour's nativity, nor of his baptism by John; though, undoubtedly, it is there supposed, and referred to. He takes no notice of our Saviour's temptation in the wilderness, nor of the call or names of the twelve apostles, nor of their mission in our Saviour's life-time, nor of our Lord's parables, or other discourses of his, recorded by them, nor of our Saviour's journies, of which they give an account, nor any of those predictions relating to the desolations of Jerusalem, which are in Matthew, Mark, and Luke. Nor has he any miracles recorded by them, excepting only that one of the multiplication of small provision for feeding five thousand, with the extraordinary circumstance of the return to Capernaum from the country, where that miracle had been wrought, ch. vi. 4—21. And it is likely, that this miracle was recorded by him, for the sake of the discourses, to which it gave occasion, and which follow there, ver. 22—71.

However, it should be observed, that he has one thing recorded by all the evangelists, Peter's striking a servant of the high priest, and cutting off his ear. Ch. xviii. 10, "Then Simon Peter having a sword, drew it, and smote the high priest's servant, and cut off his right ear. The servant's name was Malchus." Which, as St. Luke informs us, Jesus touched, and healed, ch. xxii. 51. Peter's action is mentioned by all the three evangelists, Matt. xxvi. 51; Mark xiv. 47; Luke xxii. 50. But St. John alone mentions Peter by name, and the name of the servant. I thought proper to take notice of this, though St. John does not particularly mention the miracle of healing.

St. John likewise, ch. ii. 14—22, gives an account of our Lord's cleansing the temple at his first passover, when he went to Jerusalem. All the other evangelists have a like account of our Lord's cleansing the temple, at his last passover, Matt. xxi. 12, 13; Mark xi. 15, 16; Luke xix. 45, 46. But I suppose them to be quite different actions, and that our blessed Lord twice cleansed the temple, as already shown.

4. Though the first three evangelists have not particularly recorded our Saviour's several journies to Jerusalem, as St. John has done, but have only given a particular account of his preaching there at his last passover, they were not unacquainted with them.

This may be concluded from divers things in their histories. To those, who came to apprehend him, our Lord said:

"I sat daily with you teaching in the temple, and ye laid no hold on me," Matt. xxvi. 55. And compare Mark xiv. 49; Luke xxii. 53. And among the accusations brought against him by the Jewish rulers before Pilate, they say: "He stirreth up the people, teaching throughout all Judea, beginning from Galilee, to this place," Luke xxiii. 5. Peter preaching at Jerusalem, soon after our Lord's ascension, says: "Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles, and wonders, and signs: which God did by him in the midst of you, as yourselves also know," Acts ii. 22. And at the house of Cornelius, in Cæsarea: "That word, you know, which was published throughout all Judea, and began from Galilee," Acts x. 37——"And we are witnesses of all things, which he did, both in the land of the Jews, and at Jerusalem," ver. 39. And it appears from their histories, that our Lord's fame had early reached Jerusalem. Many attended him in Galilee from thence, and from other parts. Says St. Matthew: "And there followed him great multitudes of people from Galilee, and from Decapolis, and from Judea, and from beyond Jordan," ch. iv. 25. Comp. Mark. iii. 7, 8. Again: "And the scribes, which came from Jerusalem, said: He has Beelzebub."——Mark iii. 22—30. Compare Matt. ix. 34, Luke xi. 14—26. "Then came to Jesus scribes and pharisees, which were of Jerusalem," Matt. xv. 1. Compare Mark vii. 1. And says St. Luke, ch. v. 17, "And it came to pass on a certain day, as he was teaching, that there were pharisees, and doctors of the law sitting by, which were come out of every town of Galilee, and Judea, and Jerusalem; and the power of the Lord was present to heal them." And in every one of the evangelists we may meet with scribes and pharisees opposing our Lord, watching his words and actions, cavilling with him, and reflecting upon him and his disciples.

Moreover, in St. Luke, ch. ix. 51—56, is an account of a remarkable incident, when our Lord was going from Galilee through Samaria to Jerusalem, at one of their feasts; supposed by[h] some to be the feast of tabernacles, by others[i] the feast of dedication, preceding his last passover. See likewise Luke xiii. 22, and xvii. 11.

However, after all, I do not think it was needful, that our Lord should go often to Jerusalem, or that all his journies thither, and discourses there, should be recorded. It was indeed highly expedient, that his ministry should be public: so it might be, without going often to Jerusalem.

[h] Vid. Cleric. Harmon. p. 234, 235. [i] See Dr. Doddridge's Family Expositor, Sect. 127. Vol. ii. p. 183.

John the Baptist was a man of great reputation, though he never went up to Jerusalem during the time of his showing himself unto Israel, that we know of, Luke i. 80. And it is manifest from the first three evangelists, as well as from St. John, that our Lord's ministry was very public, and well known in all parts of Judea, and the regions round about, and to men of all ranks therein. In them we find our Lord to have been notified before-hand by John the Baptist. He sent out once his twelve apostles, and then seventy other disciples, " two by two, to go before him, and prepare men for him, in every city and place where he should come." In them we find him teaching in synagogues, in cities and villages, and desert places, crowded by throngs, attended by multitudes of people, and miraculously feeding at one time five thousand, at another four thousand men, beside women and children.

It was fit, that our Lord's ministry should be very public; it is manifest, from all the four evangelists, that it was so; which cannot but be the ground of great satisfaction to us.

5. The genuineness of the twenty-first or last chapter of St. John's gospel ought not to be contested.

Grotius indeed was of opinion that[k] St. John concluded his gospel with the words which are at the end of the twentieth chapter: and that what is in the twenty-first chapter was added after St. John's death by the church of Ephesus.

Against that opinion the general, or[l] even universal consent of manuscripts and versions is a great objection. For it is very probable, that this gospel was published before St. John's death. And if there had been an edition without this chapter, it is very likely, that it would have been wanting in some copies. To which may be added, that we do not find, that any of the ancient christian writers ever made a question, whether this chapter was composed by St. John, or by another. Finally,[m] the style is St. John's. In

[k] Omnino arbitror, quæ hic sequuntur, conclusionem esse totius operis, et ibi finiisse Joannem librum, quem edidit. At, sicut caput ultimum Pentateuchi, et caput ultimum Josuæ, post Mosis et Josuæ mortem additum est a Synedrio Hebræorum; ita et caput, quod sequitur, post mortem Joannis additum ab ecclesiâ Ephesinâ, hoc maxime fine, ut ostenderetur impletum quod de longævitate ac non violentâ morte Joannis Dominus prædixerat, &c. Grot. ad Jo. xx. 30.

[l] Cæterum in tanto codicum et versionum consensu, eoque prorsus universali, cogitari non debebat, caput hoc ab ecclesiâ demum Ephesinâ accessisse. Quis enim negare tuto potest, evangelium Joannis ante ipsius obitum, adeoque ante additum hoc, quod creditur, supplementum accessisse? Et quis crediderit, vel sic omnes codices in exhibendo isto capite tam constanter consentire potuisse? Wolf. in Joh. cap. xxi. in.

[m] Rejicimus hic sententiam eorum, qui ab aliâ manu, quam ipsius Joannis

chapter xix. 35, " And he that saw it bare record; and his record is true: and he knoweth, that he says true." Here, xxi. 24, " This is the disciple, which testifieth of these things, and wrote these things; and we know that his testimony is true." Compare likewise ver. 7, and 20. The last words of the chapter, at ver. 25, are these: " And there are also many other things, which Jesus did: the which if they should be written every one, I suppose, that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written." Which clause evidently is from the same person who wrote ver. 30, and 31, of ch. xx. Here the evangelist seems to check himself, and to determine not to proceed any farther. For if he should attempt to commit to writing every thing which Jesus had said and done, he should never come to an end.

Says Dr. Whitby upon ch. xx. 31, ' Some think, that ' St. John here ended his gospel, and that the following ' chapter was written by some other hands. But these words ' give no ground for that imagination: since other apostles, ' after they seem to have concluded their epistles, add some ' new matter: as may be seen in the conclusions of the epis- ' tles to the Romans, and to the Hebrews.' See Rom. ch. xv. and xvi; Heb. xiii. 21—25. I would likewise refer to Mr. L'Enfant's note upon ch. xxi. 24, who also asserts the genuineness of this last chapter.

CHAP. X.

The Question considered, whether any of the first three evangelists had seen the gospels of the others before he wrote.

HERE I shall in the first place mention the different sentiments of learned moderns concerning this point. And then I intend to consider the merits of the question.

evangelistæ hoc caput esse adjectum putant. Nam ita clare stylum redolet apostoli, ut, si aliquis alius id adjecisset, non sine impostură istud facere potuisset. Neque enim se Joannem vocat, sed more suo discipulum, quem Jesus amabat, ver. 7, 20. Tum hæc addit: Hic est discipulus ille, qui de his testatur, et hæc scripsit, ver. 24. Quæ defendi non possunt a mendacio, si quisquam alius præter apostolum hoc caput adjecisset. Adde, quod diligentissimi circa tales circumstantias patres, Eusebius, Hieronymus, atque alii, non ita plane silentio id involvissent, &c. Fr. Lamp. in Jo. Evang. cap. xxi. tom. III. p. 720, 721. Vid. et Mill. Proleg. num. 249, 250.

Calvin,[n] in the preface to his Harmony of the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, declares it to be his opinion, that St. Mark was so far from having abridged St. Matthew's gospel, that he thinks he had never seen it: which he also supposes to have been St. Luke's case.

This likewise must have been the opinion of Basnage. For he supposeth[o] St. Luke's to have been the first written of all the gospels. Consequently this evangelist could not borrow either from St. Matthew or St. Mark.

Mr. Whiston, in[p] his Harmony of the four Evangelists, called St. Mark the epitomizer of St. Matthew. Mr. Jones, in his Vindication of St. Matthew's gospel, well and largely argued against that opinion.

Mr. Dodwell declared his opinion upon this subject after this manner: 'That[q] none of the first three evangelists had 'seen the others' gospels. Otherwise there could not have 'been in them so many seeming contradictions, which have 'exercised the thoughts of inquisitive men almost ever since 'the forming of the canon of the New Testament. Certain-'ly if St. Luke had seen the genealogy of our Lord, which is 'in St. Matthew, he would not have published another so 'very different, without assigning any reason for it.——St. 'Matthew is the only one of our evangelists who wrote be-'fore St. Luke.——St. John did not write till long after St. 'Luke, nor did Mark write till after St. Luke, if he wrote 'his gospel in the same year that he finished the Acts of 'the Apostles: which seems to me very probable: for the 'Acts are the second book of the same work, as is evident 'from what himself says, Acts i. 1. St. Luke's gospel

[n] Mihi certe magis probabile est, et ex re ipsâ conjicere licet, nunquam librum Matthæi fuisse ab eo inspectum, cum ipse suum scriberet: tantum abest, ut in compendium ex professo redigere voluerit. Idem et de Lucâ judicium facio. Calvin. Argum. in Evangel. &c.

[o] Basn. ann. 60. num. xxxi. [p] P. 102.

[q] Sic latuerant in illis terrarum angulis, in quibus scripta fuerant, evangelia, ut ne quidem resciverint recentiores evangelistæ, quid scripsissent de iisdem rebus antiquiores. Aliter foret, ne tot essent *εναντιοφανη*, quæ fere a primâ usque canonis constitutione eruditorum hominum ingenia exercuerint. Certe S Lucas, si genealogiam illam Domini in Matthæo vidisset, non aliam ipse, nihilque fere habentem commune, produxisset, ne quidem minimâ consilii tam diversi editâ ratione. S. Matthæus, qui solus e nostris Lucâ erat antiquior, ipse erat *αυτοπτης*———S. Joannes Lucâ longo erat intervallo in scriptione junior. Junior etiam S. Marcus, si quidem S. Lucas eo scripserit anno evangelium, quo Acta terminavit Apostolorum. Quod ego sane puto verisimillimum. Sunt enim Acta *δευτερος* ejusdem operis *λογος*, cujus *πρωτον λογον* ipse suum agnoscit evangelium, Act. i. 1.—Ita quo anno scriptum est a S. Lucâ evangelium, secundus fluxerit apostolo Paulo annus captivitatis Romanæ. Eo enim usque Actorum historia perducta est. S. autem Marcus, seu post obitum Petri, seu non multo ante, scripsisse videtur. Dodw. Diss. Iren. i. num. xxxix

'therefore was written in the second year of the apostle 'Paul's imprisonment at Rome: for so far the history of the 'Acts reaches. But St. Mark seems not to have written 'until after the death of St. Peter, or not long before it.' This then is the order of the four evangelists, according to Mr. Dodwell: Matthew the first, Luke the second, Mark the third, and John the fourth.

How Mr. Le Clerc argued on the same side, was[r] seen formerly.

On the other hand, Grotius says, it[s] is manifest from comparing their gospels, that Mark made use of Matthew.

Mill has spoken largely to this point in his Prolegomena. 'He says, it[t] was not the design of St. Mark, to make an 'abridgment of St. Matthew's gospel, as some have suppos-'ed. For he does not always follow St. Matthew's order, 'as an abridger would have done: and he is oftentimes 'more prolix in his histories of the same thing than St. 'Matthew, and has inserted many additional things, and 'some of great moment for illustrating the evangelical his-'tory.——Nay,[u] so far was Mark from intending to abbre-'viate St. Matthew's gospel, that there have been men of 'great fame, as Calvin, and our Dodwell, who were of opi-'nion, that St. Mark and Luke had never seen Matthew's 'gospel. However, Grotius was of a different opinion. 'And indeed the great resemblance of the style and com-'position of these two evangelists manifests the truth of it.'

Of St. Luke Mill says: 'Nothing[v] is more evident than 'that he made use of the gospels of Matthew and Mark. 'For he has borrowed from them many phrases and expres-'sions, and even whole paragraphs word for word.'

But there is not sufficient foundation for such strong assertions, in the account which Mill himself gives of the time

[r] See Vol. iv. p. 503, 504.

[s] Usum esse Marcum Matthæi evangelio apertum facit collatio. Grot. ad Marc. cap. i. ver. 1.

[t] Ipsam evangelii structuram quod attinet, neutiquam Marco institutum fuit, quod nonnullis videtur, evangelium Matthæi in epitomen redigere. Præterquam enim quod servatum a Matthæo ordinem non ubique sequatur, quod sane epitomatoris foret, in ejusdem rei narratione Matthæo haud raro prolixior est, ac plurima passim inserta habet, eaque subinde magni ad elucidandam historiam momenti. Proleg. num. 103.

[u] Imo certe adeo nihil Marco erat in animo de abbreviando Matthæi evangelio, ut haud desint magni nominis auctores, qui existimant, a Marco ne quidem visum fuisse evangelium Matthæi.—Cæterum contrarium evincit, evangelium imprimis Matthæi et Marci quod attinet, istorum phraseos, ipsiusque contextûs similitudo. Ibid. n. 107.

[v] Certe evulgatum fuisse illud post editionem evangeliorum Matthæi et Marci, ex collatione trium horum inter se luce clarius apparet. Nihil scilicet evidentius, quam D. Lucam evangeliorum Matthæi et Marci ipsas ῥησεις, phrases et locutiones, imo vero totas pericopas, in suum nonnunquam αυτολεξει, traduxisse. Ib. num. 116.

of writing the first three gospels: for, according to him, St. Matthew's gospel was published in[w] the year 61, St. Mark's[x] in 63, St. Luke's[y] in 64, which is but one year later. Nor has Mill made it out, that St. Mark's was published so soon as the year 63. For he owns, that it was not written till after Peter's and Paul's departure from Rome; which could not be till after the year 63. How then could St. Luke make so much use of St. Mark's gospel, as is pretended?

I allege but one author more, relating to this point. Mr. Wetstein says, that[z] Mark made use of Matthew: and of St. Luke he says, 'that[a] he transcribed many things from 'Matthew, and yet more from Mark.'

But may I not say, that before Mr. Wetstein asserted such things, he should have given at least some tolerable account of the times when the evangelists wrote, and that St. Mark was prior in time to Luke? Which I do not perceive him to have done. St. Matthew's gospel, indeed, he supposes to have been written[b] in the eighth year after our Lord's ascension. But of St. Luke he observes, that[c] ecclesiastical writers say, he published his gospel at about fifteen, or as others, about two and twenty years after our Saviour's ascension. His account of St. Mark is, 'that[d] he was with 'Peter at Babylon. Thence he came to Rome, and was 'with St. Paul during his captivity there, Col. iv. 10; Phi-'lem. 23. Then he went to Colosse. Afterwards at the 'desire of the apostle he came to him thence to Rome, 2 'Tim. iv. 11. Where he is said to have written his gospel, 'abridging St. Matthew, and adding some things which he 'had heard from Peter.' A very fine character of our evangelist truly! But according to this account of St. Mark's travels, and of the place where his gospel was written, it could not be published before the year 64, or 65. How then could St. Luke make use of it, if he wrote so soon as fifteen or two and twenty years after Christ's ascension?

I proceed now to speak more distinctly to the merits of the question.

[w] Proleg. num. 61.
[x] Ibid. num. 101.
[y] Ibid. num. 112.
[z] De Marco, ap. T. Gr. T. I. p. 552.
[a] Lucam multa ex Matthæo, ex Marco plura descripsisse, ex collatione patet. De Lucâ, ibid. p. 643.
[b] Ibid. p. 223.
[c] Ibid. p. 643.
[d] Postea videtur Petro adhæsisse, et cum eo Babylone fuisse, 1 Pet. v. 13. Inde Romam venit, Paulumque captivum invisit, Col. iv. 10; Philem. 23. Inde ad Colossenses abiit, a quibus rogatu Pauli Romam rediit, 2 Tim. iv. 11, ubi evangelium conscripsisse, et Matthæum quidem in compendium redegisse, nonnulla vero, quæ a Petro audiverat, adjecisse dicitur. Ibid. p. 551.

1. It does not appear that any of the learned ancient christian writers had a suspicion, that any of the first three evangelists had seen the other histories before they wrote. They say indeed, 'that when the three first-written gospels 'had been delivered to all men, they were also brought to 'St. John, and that he confirmed the truth of their narration: 'but said, there were some things omitted by them, which 'might be profitably related:' or, 'that he wrote last, supplying some things, which had been omitted by the former evangelists.' After this manner speak[e] Eusebius of Cæsarea, [f] Epiphanius, [g] Theodore of Mopsuestia, and [h] Jerom. Not now to mention any others. Augustine indeed, about the end of the fourth century, or the beginning of the fifth, supposeth[i] the first three evangelists not to have been totally ignorant of each other's labours, and considers Mark's gospel as an abridgment of St. Matthew's. But, as[k] formerly observed, so far as I know, he is the first, in which that opinion is found: nor does it appear, that he was followed by succeeding writers.

2. It is not suitable to the character of any of the evangelists, that they should abridge or transcribe another historian.

St. Matthew was an apostle, and eye-witness: consequently, he was able to write of his own knowledge. Or, if there were any parts of our Lord's ministry, at which he was not present, he might obtain information from his fellow-apostles, or other eye-witnesses. And as for other things, which happened before the apostles were called to follow him, concerning his nativity, infancy, and youth; as Augustine[l] says, these the apostles might know from Christ himself, or from his parents, or his friends and acquaintance, who were to be depended upon.

St. Mark, if he was not one of Christ's seventy disciples, was an early Jewish believer, acquainted with all the apostles, Peter in particular, and with many other eye-witnesses: consequently, well qualified to write a gospel. Mill[m] himself has been so good as to acknowledge this.

[e] See Vol. iv. p. 95. [f] P. 189. [g] P. 398, 399.
[h] P. 446. [i] P. 502. [k] P. 504.
[l] P. 501.

[m] Marcus ille, quisquis fuerit, ad evangelium conscribendum abunde instructus accedebat. Si enim filius fuit Mariæ, civis istius Hierosolymitanæ———ei sane jam a tempore conversionis tam frequens intercesserat, ac plane familiare cum ipsis apostolis commercium, ut vix aliqua ætatis suæ pars ipsorum consortio vacârit: ita ut quotidie ab illis petere licuerit de dictis ac factis Domini παραδοσεις, quas conferret in commentarium. Sane, quisquis fuerit hic Marcus, apud veteres plane convenit, fuisse eum D. Petri comitem et interpretem; ipsumque comitatum fuisse Ro-

St. Luke, if he was not one of Christ's seventy disciples, nor an eye witness, was a disciple, and companion of apostles, especially of Paul, as is universally allowed: and he must therefore have been well qualified to write a gospel. Moreover,[n] as has been shown, it is manifest from his introduction, that he knew not of any authentic history of Jesus Christ, that had been yet written. And he expressly says of himself, "that he had perfect understanding of all things from the very first," and he professeth "to write of them to Theophilus in order." After all this, to say, that he transcribed many things from one historian, and yet more from another, so far as I am able to judge, is no less than a contradiction of the evangelist himself.

3. The nature and design of the first three gospels manifestly show, that the evangelists had not seen any authentic written history of Jesus Christ.

This is one of the observations of Le Clerc relating to this point. 'We[o] can scarcely doubt, whether St. John 'had seen the other three gospels. For as he is said to 'have lived to a great age, so it appears from his gospel it-'self, that he took care not to repeat things related by them, 'except a few only, and those necessary things. But I do 'not see how it can be reckoned certain that Mark knew of 'Matthew's having written a gospel before him: or that 'Luke knew, that they two had written gospels before him. 'If Mark had seen the work of Matthew, it is likely that he 'would have remained satisfied with it, as being the work 'of an apostle of Christ, that is, an eye-witness, which he 'was not.' And what there follows.

I must enlarge upon this observation. I forbear to insist now on the genealogies, which are in St. Matthew, and St. Luke only. But I say, that the writings of all and each one of these three evangelists contain an entire gospel, or a complete history of the ministry of Jesus Christ: or, to borrow St. Luke's expressions, Acts i. 1, 2, a history of "all that Jesus both did and taught, until the day, in the which he was taken up to heaven." For in all and every one of them is the history of our Lord's forerunner, his baptism, preaching, and death, and of our Lord's being baptized by him: when, by a voice from heaven, he was proclaimed to be the Messiah. Then follows our Lord's temptation in the wilderness. After which is an account of our Lord's preach-

mam usque———adeo ut ex apostoli κηρυσσομενοις acceperit necesse sit plenissimam et exactissimam historiæ totius evangelicæ cognitionem. Mill. Proleg. n. 102.

[n] See before, p. 292—294.

[o] See Vol. iv. p. 504, 505.

ing, and his beginning to gather disciples, the choice of the twelve apostles, and their names: and our Lord's going over the land of Israel, preaching the doctrine of the kingdom, attended by his twelve apostles, in synagogues, and in cities and villages, working all kinds of healing and saving miracles, upon all sorts of persons, in all places, in the presence of multitudes, and before scribes and pharisees, as well as others. A particular mission of his apostles, in the land of Israel. Our Lord's transfiguration on the mount, when there appeared Moses and Elias talking with him, and there came a voice from heaven, saying: "This is my beloved Son, hear him." His going up to Jerusalem, and making a public entrance into the city, then cleansing the temple, where he often taught the people, and preached the gospel, and openly asserted his authority and character: keeping the passover with his disciples, and instituting a memorial of himself: his last sufferings, and death, with the behaviour of Judas the traitor, Peter, and the rest of the disciples: his burial, resurrection, with the evidences of it, and the general commission to his apostles, to preach the gospel in all the world, and to all sorts of persons therein.

Here are all the integrals of a gospel. And they are properly filled up. And all these things are in all and every one of the first three evangelists: which show that they did not know of each other's writings. For it cannot be thought that they should be disposed to say the same things over and over, or to repeat what had been well said already. St. John, who had seen the other three gospels, has little in common with them: almost every thing in his gospel is new and additional. So it would have been with every other writer in the like circumstances.

And if St. Matthew's gospel had been written at about eight, or fifteen, or twenty years after our Lord's ascension, and had become generally known among the faithful, (as it certainly would, soon after it was written,) it is not improbable, that we should have had but two gospels, his and St. John's. Or if there had been several, they would all, except the first, have been in the manner of supplements, like St. John's, not entire gospels, like those of the first three evangelists.

This consideration appears to me of great moment, for showing that our first three evangelists are all independent witnesses. Indeed it seems to me to be quite satisfactory and decisive.

4. There are in these three gospels, as was observed just now by Mr. Dodwell, many seeming contradictions: which

have exercised the skill of thoughtful men to reconcile them. This is another argument, that these evangelists did not write by concert, or after having seen each others' gospels.

5. In some histories, which are in all these three evangelists, there are small varieties and differences, which plainly show the same thing. I shall allege two or three instances only.

(1.) In Matth. viii. 28—34; Mark v. 1—20; Luke viii. 26—40, is the account of the cure of the dæmoniac, or dæmoniacs, in the country of the Gadarenes. It is plainly the same history, as appears from many agreeing circumstances: nevertheless there are several differences. St. Matthew speaks of two men, St. Mark and St. Luke of one only. In Mark alone it is said, that the man was always night and day in the mountains, crying, and cutting himself with stones. And he alone mentions the number of the swine that were drowned. He likewise says, that the man besought our Lord much, that he would not send them away out of the country. St. Luke says, the dæmons besought him, that he would not command them to go out into the deep, or abyss. Surely these evangelists did not abridge, or transcribe each others' writings.

(2.) In Matt. xvii. 1—13; Mark ix. 1—13; Luke ix. 28—36, are the accounts of our Lord's transfiguration on the mount. Where St. Matthew says: "His face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light." St. Mark: "And his raiment became shining, exceeding white as snow, so as no fuller on earth can white them." St. Luke: "And as he prayed, the fashion of his countenance was altered, and his raiment was white and glittering." It is plain, I think, that none had seen what the other had written. In the description of the splendour of our Lord's person and garments, each one follows his own fancy. In St. Matthew and St. Mark are comparisons; but they are different. In St. Luke there is no comparison at all.

(3.) The third instance shall be what follows next in all the three evangelists, after our Lord was come down from the mount. Matt. xvii. 14—21; Mark ix. 14—29; Luke ix. 37—42. In this history of the healing the young man, who had the epilepsy, where St. Mark is more particular and prolix than the other evangelists, there are many differences: I take notice of a very few only. In St. Matthew the father of the child says: Lord, have mercy on my son, for he is lunatic, and sore vexed: and the healing him is thus related. "And Jesus rebuked the dæmon, and he departed out of

him. And the child was cured from that very hour." In St. Mark, the father of the child says to our Lord: "Master, I have brought unto thee my son, who has a dumb spirit," and when our Lord healed him, "he rebuked the foul spirit, saying unto him: Thou dumb and deaf spirit, I charge thee, come out of him, and enter no more into him." And what follows. In St. Luke the father says: "Master, I beseech thee, look upon my son, for he is my only child."

Certainly, he who observes these things, must be sensible, that these historians did not borrow from each other: there are many other like instances: to mention them all would be endless.

I shall add a consideration or two more, which must be allowed to be of some weight in this question.

6. There are some things in St. Matthew's gospel, very remarkable, of which no notice is taken either by St. Mark, or St. Luke.

I intend, particularly, the visit of the Magians, with the causes of it, and its circumstances, and then the consequences of it, our Saviour's flight into Egypt, and the slaughter of the infants at Bethlehem, and near it, Matt. ii. The dream of Pilate's wife, ch. xxvii. 19, the affair of the Roman guard at the sepulchre, ch. xxviii. 11—15, "an earthquake, rending of rocks," and "the resurrection of many saints, who came out of their graves, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many," ch. xxvii. 51—53.

These are as extraordinary things as any in the gospels: and if St. Mark, or St. Luke, had written with a view of abridging, or confirming St. Matthew's history, some, or all of these things, would have been taken notice of by them. It is also very observable, that St. Luke has no account of the miracle of feeding "four thousand with seven loaves and a few little fishes," which is in Matt. xv. 32—39; Mark viii. 1—9.

And what has been just now said of St. Matthew, particularly, may be also applied to St. Luke, supposing his to have been the first-written gospel: for in him also are many remarkable things, not to be found in the other gospels. And if St. Matthew or St. Mark had written with a view of abridging or confirming St. Luke's history, those things would not have been passed over by them without any notice.

7. All the first three evangelists have many things peculiar to themselves: which shows that they did not borrow from each other, and that they were all well acquainted with the things of which they undertook to write a history.

Many such things are in Matthew, as is well known to all: I therefore need not enlarge on them; and a few of them were just now taken notice of.

St. Mark likewise has many things peculiar to himself, not mentioned by any other evangelist: a catalogue of them was made by us[p] formerly, though far from being complete.

The same is true of St. Luke. As much was observed by Irenæus, who says, 'There are many, and those necessary 'parts of the gospel, which we know from Luke only.' His brief enumeration of those things was transcribed by us into this work[q] long ago. Let me also rehearse them here somewhat differently. His general introduction, the birth of John the Baptist, and many extraordinary things attending it. The Roman census made in Judea, by Cyrenius, or before that made by Cyrenius, which brought Joseph and Mary from Nazareth to Bethlehem; the mean circumstances of our Lord's nativity; the notification of it to shepherds by an angel; his circumcision; Mary's purification at the temple; the prophecies of Simeon and Anna there; our Lord's going up to Jerusalem at the age of twelve years, ch. ii. The names of the emperor and other princes, in whose time John the Baptist and our Lord began to preach, and our Lord's age at that time; a genealogy different from Matthew, ch. iii. In St. Luke are also divers miracles, not recorded elsewhere. A numerous draught of fishes, ch. v. 4—9. The cures of Mary Magdalene, Joanna, wife of Chuza, Herod's steward, and Susanna, ch. viii. 2, 3; giving speech to a dumb man, ch. xi. 14; a woman healed in a synagogue of an infirmity, under which she had laboured eighteen years, ch. xiii. 10—17, the man cured of a dropsy on a sabbath-day, in the house of a pharisee, ch. xiv. 1—4. Ten lepers cured at once, ch. xvii. 12—19, the ear of Malchus healed, ch. xxii. 50, 51; the son of a widow of Nain raised to life, in the sight of multitudes, when he was carried out to burial, ch. vii. 11—17; a miracle of resurrection, related by no other evangelist. In him alone is the mission of the seventy disciples, ch. x. 1—20. Divers beautiful parables spoken by our Lord, which are not to be found elsewhere: the parable of the good Samaritan, ch. x. 25—37; the parable of the lost piece of silver, and the prodigal son, ch. xv. 8—32; of the unjust steward, xvi. 1—12; the rich man and Lazarus, ver. 19—31; the importunate widow, xviii. 1—8; the pharisee and publican that went up to the temple to pray, ver. 9—14. To St. Luke also are peculiar our Lord's entertainment at the house of a pharisee,

[p] See before, p. 345—350. [q] Vol. ii. p. 171—173.

where came in a woman that was a sinner, ch. vii. 36—50; his entertainment at the house of Martha, ch. x. 38—42; the history of Zaccheus, ch. xix. 1—10; our Lord's agony in the garden, ch. xxii. 43, 44; the penitent thief on the cross, ch. xxiii. 39—43; and a particular account of the two disciples going to Emmaus, ch. xxiv. 13—35.

All these, and many other things, which I omit, are peculiar to St. Luke. And did he transcribe many things from St. Matthew, and yet more from St. Mark?

Mill's argument, taken from the similitude of style and composition, to prove, that these evangelists had seen each others' writings, appears to be insufficient. And himself allows, that[r] two authors writing upon the same subject in the Greek language may easily agree very much in expression.

I have insisted the more upon this point, because I think, that to say the evangelists abridged and transcribed each other, without giving any hint of their so doing, is a great disparagement to them: and it likewise diminisheth the value and importance of their testimony. Said Mr. Le Clerc, before quoted, 'They[s] seem to think more justly, who say, 'that the first three evangelists were unacquainted with 'each other's design. In that way greater weight accrues 'to their testimony. When witnesses agree, who have first 'laid their heads together, they are suspected. But wit-'nesses, who testify the same thing separately, without 'knowing what others have said, are justly credited.'

This is not a new opinion, lately thought of: nor has it been taken up by me, out of opposition to any. I have all my days read, and admired the first three evangelists, as independent, and harmonious witnesses. And I know not how to forbear ranking the other opinion among those bold, as well as groundless assertions, in which critics too often indulge themselves, without considering the consequences.

[r] Verum quidem est, eum esse linguæ hujus, quæ evangelistis in usu erat, Hellenisticæ genium, eam indolem, ut in unum ferme eundemque dicendi characterem, quoties de unâ eâdemque materiâ agitur, sese efformet; ita ut diversi in hoc genere scriptores, unum idemque aliquod argumentum particulare tractantes, stylo ac sermonis tenore haud absimili usuri essent, &c. Prol. num. 108.

[s] See Vol. iii. p. 504.

CHAP. XI.

ST. PAUL.

I. *His history before his conversion, and his general character.* II. *The time of his conversion.* III. *Observations upon his conversion, and the circumstances of things at that time in Judea.* IV. *His age at the time of his conversion.* V. *When he was made an apostle.* VI. *The history of his travels, and preaching: particularly, from the time of his conversion and apostleship, to his coming from Damascus to Jerusalem, the first time after his conversion.* VII. *From his coming first to Jerusalem to his being brought to Antioch by Barnabas.* VIII. *To his coming up to Jerusalem with the contributions of the christians at Antioch.* IX. *To his coming to the council at Jerusalem about the year* 49. X. *To his coming to Jerusalem with contributions of divers gentile churches, in the year* 58, *when he was apprehended, and imprisoned.* XI. *To the end of his imprisonment at Rome.* XII. *To the time of his death.*

I. SAUL, called also PAUL, by which name he was generally called, after his preaching in gentile countries, and, particularly,[a] among Greeks and Romans, a descendant of the patriarch Abraham, one of God's ancient chosen people of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, was[b] a native of Tarsus, then the chief city of Cilicia. He was also by birth a[c] citizen of Rome. How he became entitled to that privilege,

[a] Acts xiii. 9. "Then Saul, who also is called Paul," Σαῦλος δε, ὁ και Παυλος. Id est, qui ex quo cum Romanis conversari cœpit, hoc nomine, a suo non abludente, cœpit a Romanis appellari. Sic qui Jesus Judæis, Græcis Jason; Hillel, Pollio:———apud Romanos Silas, Silvanus, ut notavit Hieronymus. Grot. in Act. xiii. 9.

Hoc primum loco cœpit apostolus a Lucâ Paulus dici, quem ubique antea Saulum vocavit. Nec deinceps alio quam Pauli nomine usquam vocabit.——Alii igitur apostolum jam inde ab initio binominem fuisse putant, ut ex altero homine Judæus, ex altero Romanus civis esse intelligeretur. Alii cum religione nomen eum mutâsse putant, cum ex pharisæo fieret christianus.—Sunt demum qui a Sergio Paulo proconsule ad Christum converso hoc cognomen adeptum esse putent.——Ac facile mihi quidem persuadeo, primum a proconsulis Romani familiâ ita vocari cœpisse. Bez. Annot. in Act. xiii. 9. See likewise Dr. Doddridge's Family Expositor, Vol. iii. p. 198. note [k], or upon Acts xiii. 9.

[b] Acts xxi. 39. xxii. 3.

[c] Acts xvi. 37, 38. xxii. 25—29. xxiii. 27.

has been distinctly shown[d] in another place. His father[e] was a pharisee, and himself was of the same sect. He had a sister, whose son was a christian, and a discreet person, who[f] was of great service to his uncle Paul, when a prisoner at Jerusalem. His conduct cannot be thought of without admiration and gratitude. Some others of his relations are mentioned by him in his epistle to the Romans, who also were believers in Jesus, and several of them had been so before himself: which may be reckoned a proof of the virtue and piety of this family. Their names are Andronicus, and Junia, whom he calls "his kinsmen," συγγενεις μου. Rom. xvi. 7. By[g] which he must mean something more than their being his countrymen. He speaks in the like manner of Herodian, ver. 11, and also of Lucius, Jason, and Sosipater, ver. 21. It may be reckoned very probable, that[h] he was educated in Greek literature in his early life at Tarsus. It is certain, that[i] he was for a while under the instructions of Gamaliel, at Jerusalem, a celebrated Jewish Rabbi, and that[k] he made great proficiency in the study of the law, and the traditions, much esteemed by that people. He seems to have been[l] a person of great natural abilities, of quick apprehension, strong passions, and firm resolution, and thereby qualified for signal service, as a teacher of such principles as he should embrace, whatever they were. He appears likewise to have been always unblamable in his life, and strictly faithful to the dictates of his conscience, according to the knowledge which he had. Of this all must

[d] See Vol. i. p. 240, 241.

[e] Acts xxiii. 6; xxvi. 5; Philip. iii. 5.

[f] Acts xxiii. 16—22.

[g] 'Cognatos suos,' id est ejusdem secum generis, vocat, ut multi exponunt, quia Judæi erant, quemadmodum supra ix. 3, de Judæis in universum dixit, 'qui sunt cognati mei secundum 'carnem;' et sic eum loqui, ut Judæorum qui Romæ erant gratiam sibi conciliet. Verum, quia multi Romæ erant Judæi christiani, et proinde hac generali ratione Paulo cognati; ideirco putant alii, cognatos hic dici magis proprie, ut qui fuerint Paulo contribules, id est, de tribu Benjamin, aut forte etiam propriore sanguinis vinculo conjuncti. Est. in Rom. xvi. 7.

[h] This may be argued from the place of his nativity, Tarsus, which was celebrated for polite literature, and from St. Paul's quotations of several Greek poets, Acts xvii. 28; 1 Cor. xv. 33; Tit. i. 12. Dr. Bentley begins his third Sermon at Boyle's Lecture, which is the second upon Acts xvii. 27, 28, in this manner, 'I have said enough in my last, to show the fitness and pertinence of 'the apostle's discourse———and that he did not talk at random, but was 'thoroughly acquainted with the several humours and opinions of his auditors. 'And, as "Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians," so it is 'manifest from this chapter alone, if nothing else had been now extant, that 'St. Paul was a great master in all the learning of the Greeks.'

[i] Acts xxii. 3.

[k] Acts xxii. 3; xxvi. 5; Gal. i. 14.

[l] ——— sectâ pharisæum, excellenti magnoque ingenio præditum, literarum judaïcarum imprimis peritum, nec Græcarum expertem. J. L. Moshem. de Reb. Christian. ante Constantin. sect. 1. n. xv. p. 80.

be persuaded, who observe his[m] appeals to the Jews, upon this head, when they were greatly offended with him; and from[n] the undissembled satisfaction which he expresseth upon a serious recollection of his former and later conduct. For some while, after the first appearance of christianity in the world, he was a bitter enemy and furious opposer of all who made profession of it. Nevertheless he persisted not long in that course: but was in a very extraordinary manner converted to that faith himself, and ever after he was a steady friend, and zealous advocate for it, and very successful in defending and propagating it, diligently improving the gifts and qualifications extraordinarily vouchsafed him for that purpose. These things are recorded in those writings, which are in the highest esteem, and reckoned sacred among christians, and indeed are well known to all the world.

II. I am desirous to do my best to settle the time of St. Paul's conversion. If we can do that with some good degree of probability, we shall attain to a near knowledge of the time of St. Stephen's martyrdom: concerning both which events there have been very different opinions in former and later ages. Valesius, in his Annotations upon Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History, mentions divers opinions of ancient writers[o] about the time of St. Stephen's death. As the passage may be acceptable to some, I have placed it below.

Among moderns, Cave thought that[p] Stephen was stoned, and Paul converted in the year of our Lord's ascension, the year 33, or the beginning of the year following. Pearson supposeth that[q] Stephen was stoned in 34, and Paul converted in 35, near the end of the year. Having been three years in Arabia, and at Damascus, he came to Jerusalem, near the end of 38; in which year, or the beginning of the following, he went to Tarsus; where, and in Syria, he was

[m] Acts xxiii. 1; xxvi. 4, 5. [n] Philip. iii. 6; 1 Tim. i. 13; 2 Tim. i. 3. [o] Quo anno Stephanus martyrii coronam adeptus sit, non convenit inter omnes. Alii eodem anno, quo passus est Christus, lapidatum illum volunt. Ita diserte scribitur in Excerptis Chronologicis, quæ cum Eusebii Chronico edidit Scaliger, pag. 68. Et hæc videtur fuisse Eusebii sententia, ut ex hoc loco apparet.———Alii vero triennio post Christi mortem martyrium Stephani retulerunt.—Ita scribit in Chronico Georgius Syncellus. Multi etiam ulterius processerunt, et Stephanum anno ab ordinatione suâ septimo passum esse scripserunt. Inter quos est Evodius apud Nicephorum, et Hippolytus Thebanus, et auctor Chronici Alexandrini, qui anno Claudii primo martyrium Stephani adsignat. Vales. Annot. in Euseb. l. 2. cap. i. [p] ——— ad fidem Christi conversus, discipulus fit et apostolus, A. C. 33 exeunte, vel saltem ineunte proximo. Hist. Lit. T. I. in S. Paulo. [q] Annal. Paulin. p. 1—4.

four years, that is, 39, 40, 41, 42. Which appears to me a long space of time. In 43 he came to Antioch. And having spent a year there, he came to Jerusalem in 44. So Pearson.

Frederic Spanheim, who also has bestowed great pains in examining this point, placeth[r] the conversion of Paul in the year 40, the last of Caius Caligula: and was inclined to defer it to the first of Claudius, the year 41. Him[s] Witsius follows. And J. A. Fabricius[t] declares his assent to the same opinion.

L'Enfant and Beausobre, in their general preface to St. Paul's epistles, place his conversion in the year 36, and his first coming to Jerusalem after it in 39; which opinion I believe to be nearer the truth than any of the foregoing.

There is an event mentioned in the Acts, about which we may receive light from external history. I mean, "the rest of the churches throughout all Judea, and Galilee, and Samaria," Acts ix. 31.

In the former part of this work[u] it was shown to be very probable, that this rest of the churches of Christ was owing to the state of things in Judea, when Petronius, president of Syria, published the orders which he had received from Caius, to erect his statue in the temple of Jerusalem, in the year of Christ 39, or 40. Which account was afterwards followed by Dr. Benson in his[v] History of the first Planting the Christian Religion. Dr. Doddridge[w] likewise declared his approbation of it.

When I formerly argued, that this rest of the churches was occasioned by the above-mentioned order of the emperor Caius, I did not know that any one had assigned that as the occasion of it. But since, I have perceived, that[x] S. Bas-

[r] ——— in anno conversionis Pauli, quam non anteriorem esse Caii ultimo, audacter pronuntiamus. De Conversion. Paulin. Epochâ. num. xix. Opp. T. II. p. 321. [s] De Vitâ Pauli, Sect. ii. n. 22. ap. Miletem. Leyd. p. 34. [t] Tantum noto in præsenti, me sequi eorum rationes, qui Paulum conversum esse existimant anno quarto sive ultimo Caii, an. 40, et capite truncatum A. C. 68, Neronis xiv. Fabr. Bib. Gr. T. III. p. 151. *(f)*. [u] See Vol. i. sect. xii. p. 90—104. especially near the end of that section. [v] See of that work B. I. ch. 9. sect. iii. at the end. [w] Family Expositor, Vol. III. p. 147. [x] Mira hæc, et præter omnium expectationem exorta rerum vicissitudo fuit. Cui non minimum contulit infelix Judæorum status, quibus a Caligulâ vexatis, timentibusque templi violationem Petronio mandatam, Christi discipulorum persecutioni vacare non licuit. Cum enim constituendæ ecclesiarum paci sæpe numero Dei sapientia occasionibus utatur, atque humanis auxiliis; probabilis utique affertur conjectura, eo sopitum fuisse Judæorum furorem, quia propriis pressi miseriis ab inferendâ ecclesiæ calamitate prohibebantur.———Nec inopinatæ tranquillitatis aptior ulla ratio reddi potest. Ann. 40. num. xvi.

nage had thought of it, and spoke to it very well. I was led to my observations by reading Philo, and Josephus: from whom I formed the argument, and overlooked the just-mentioned ecclesiastical historian.

I supposed that[y] Petronius published his order in the year 39, or 40. Basnage[z] and Tillemont[a] say, in the year 40. By whom I am not unwilling to be determined.

It is allowed, that Petronius was sent governor into Syria by Caius in the third year of his reign, A. D. 39. And it is supposed by them, that[b] Petronius came into the province about autumn in the year 39. And Josephus says, 'that[c] 'Caius, greatly incensed against the Jews for not paying 'him the same respect that others did, sent Petronius go-'vernor into Syria, commanding him to set up his statue in 'the temple: and if the Jews opposed it, to march into the 'country with a numerous army, and effect it by force.'

Whenever Petronius published that order, whether in the year 39, or 40, I think it was the occasion of the tranquillity of the churches of Christ, spoken of by St. Luke. And I persuade myself, that most people will readily be of the same opinion.

We will now take a paragraph or two in the Acts, ch. ix. 26—31, "And when Saul was come to Jerusalem, he assayed to join himself to the disciples.——And he was with them, coming in, and going out, at Jerusalem. And he spoke boldly in the name of the Lord Jesus, and disputed against the Grecians. But they went about to slay him. Which when the brethren knew, they brought him down to Cæsarea, and sent him forth to Tarsus. Then had the churches rest throughout all Judea, and Galilee, and Samaria, and were edified."

This rest, we may suppose, was not complete, or made extensive and universal, till the year 40 perhaps, nor till near the middle of it. But when did Paul come to Jerusalem? Before this rest? or, not till after it was commenced? Basnage[d] thinks that Paul came to Jerusalem in the year 40. Let us however make a few remarks.

[y] See the place referred to above at note [u]. [z] Ubi supra, num. v.

[a] Ruine des Juifs, art. xviii. xix. Hist. des Emp. tom. I.

[b] Sed ex Josephi historiâ constat, illum in provinciam anno tertio Caii advenisse, circa autumnum. Noris. Cenot. Pisan. Diss. 2. p. 371. Conf. Usser. Ann. 39.

[c] *Γαϊος δε εν δεινῳ φερων, εις τοσον δε ὑπο Ιϐδαιων περιωφθαι μονων, πρεσϐευτην επι Συριας εκπεμπει Πετρωνιον——κελευων χειρι πολλῃ εισϐαλλοντι εις την Ιϐδαιαν, ει μεν ἑκοντες δεχωνται, ἱσαν αυτον ανδριαντα εν τῳ ναῳ τϐ Θεϐ· ει δ' αγνωμοσυνῃ χρωντο, πολεμῳ κρατησαντα τϐτο ποιειν.* Antiq. l. 18. cap. ix. n. 2. al. cap. xi.

[d] Ann. 40. num. xv.

The peace, of which we are speaking, seems not to have commenced, nor the persecution to have ceased, when Paul arrived at Jerusalem from Damascus. For when he "spake boldly in the name of the Lord Jesus," and disputed with the Grecians, "they went about to slay him:" as we have seen in the paragraph just transcribed. And the brethren found it needful to conduct him with care to Cæsarea, and send him thence to Tarsus. Moreover, Peter was at Jerusalem when Paul arrived there, and "he abode with him fifteen days," Gal. i. 18. But when the peace of the churches was established, Peter left Jerusalem, and visited the saints in the several parts of Judea: as we learn from the history immediately following, Acts ix. 31—43. Once more, it appears from the above-cited paragraph, and the course of St. Luke's narration, that this rest of the churches in Judea did not begin until after Paul had been sent thence. And if it had commenced sooner, in all probability he would have been induced to stay longer there among the Jews, for whose conversion he was ardently concerned. St. Luke's words are, as above: "Which when the brethren knew, they brought him down to Cæsarea, and sent him forth to Tarsus. Then had the churches rest throughout all Judea, and Galilee, and Samaria, and were edified."

I apprehend it to be probable, then, that Paul came to Jerusalem at this season, near the end of the year 39, or in the beginning of the year 40. We now proceed.

St. Paul says, Gal. i. 15—18, that "when it pleased God by his grace to reveal his Son in him,——he went into Arabia, and returned again unto Damascus. Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem to see Peter." For the time of Paul's conversion therefore we must look back "three years." And if those three years are to be understood complete, and he came to Jerusalem in the year 40, he was converted not long after the beginning of the year 37, where it is placed by[e] Basnage. If he came to Jerusalem before the end of the year 39, he might be converted near the end of the year 36.

Let me add. Paul says, "After[f] three years I went up to Jerusalem:" which may be well understood to mean somewhat more than three years. And then, though Paul should be supposed not to have returned to Jerusalem till the beginning of the year 40, he may have been converted before the end of the year 36.

Shall we now look somewhat farther back, and inquire how long this might be after the death of Stephen? Lewis

[e] Ann. 37. n. 48.

[f] ——μετα ετη τρια.

Capellus[g] and Fr. Spanheim[h] supposed that two years passed between the death of Stephen and Paul's conversion. And for certain there was some good space of time between Stephen's martyrdom, and Paul's journey to Damascus. This appears from St. Luke's history, who says, Acts vii. 58, "And they cast Stephen out of the city, and stoned him. And the witnesses laid down their clothes at a young man's feet, whose name was Saul." It follows in ch. viii. 1—4, "And Saul was consenting unto his death. At that time there was a great persecution against the church which was at Jerusalem. And they were all scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria, except the apostles. As for Saul, he made havoc of the church, entering into every house, and haling men and women, committed them to prison." After which, at ver. 5—40, is an account of the preaching of those who were "scattered abroad," particularly of Philip's going to the city Samaria, and preaching there with great success, and of the apostles, who were at Jerusalem, hearing of this, and sending to Samaria Peter and John: and then, how Philip taught and baptized the chamberlain of Candace, queen of Ethiopia. After which Philip preached in all the cities from Azotus, till he came to Cæsarea by the sea-side. Still Saul was a persecutor. For it follows, ch. ix. 1, 2, "And Saul, yet breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord, went unto the high priest: and desired of him letters to Damascus, to the synagogues; that if he found any of this way, whether they were men or women, he might bring them bound to Jerusalem." To all which might be added, that Paul's ill treatment of the disciples at Jerusalem was well known at Damascus before he arrived there, as appears from Acts ix. 13.

Nevertheless I do not think that there is sufficient reason to protract this space so long as two years: but would hope it might be reduced within the compass of a year, and perhaps to little more than half a year. So thought Basnage. Who[i] therefore placeth the martyrdom of Stephen and the baptism of Paul in one and the same year.

I am the more inclined to think that Paul's course of opposition against the believers did not exceed the space of a

[g] Porro interim———Saülus, qui Stephani morti consenserat, cum per biennium ecclesiam Dei Jerosolymis vastâsset.———Lud. Capel. Hist. Apost. p. 7.

[h] Ex dictis constare arbitramur———rursum anni minimum unius decursum, si non verius biennii (quale et Lud. Capellus post Danæum nostrum, aliosque, statuit) a cæde hujus ad Saüli profectionem Damascenam supponendum esse. Spanh. Diss. de Convers. Paulin. Epoch. n. xx.

[i] A. D. 37. num. 48.

year, at the utmost: because it seems to have been confined to the city of Jerusalem, until he undertook to go to Damascus, and did not reach into the cities of Judea and Samaria. This will lead us to place the martyrdom of Stephen in the year 36, and not far from the beginning of it, or else near the end of the year 35.

Indeed that is a very likely season, and much confirmed by the state of things in Judea about this time, as distinctly represented by us long ago, in the first part of this work, when we treated of affairs and persons, occasionally mentioned in the books of the New Testament. It was then shown, that[k] Pontius Pilate was removed from his government in Judea, before the passover of the year 36, probably, five or six months before that passover, in September or October, A. D. 35, about a year and half before the death of Tiberius. It was also shown, that[l] after the removal of Pilate, no governor, or procurator, with the right of the sword, or the power of life and death, was sent into Judea, neither in the remaining part of the reign of Tiberius, nor in the reign of Caius. Which[m] afforded the Jews an opportunity to be licentious, and to do many things, which otherwise they could not have done, and to be extremely troublesome to the disciples of Jesus.

Thus then Paul was converted in 37, or possibly, before the end of the year 36. And Stephen was stoned in the beginning of the same year, or, at the soonest, near the end of the year 35.

III. Having distinctly considered these things, and produced such probable evidence as offers, I beg leave to mention several observations.

1. The persecution, which began at the death of Stephen, continued four years.

The disciples of Jesus, as appears from the first chapters of the book of the Acts, were much harassed by the Jewish council from the beginning. But now, after Stephen was stoned, a more open and violent persecution came on, which[n] lasted a good while. I am not able to assign a more likely time for the commencement of it, than the beginning of the

[k] See Vol. i. p. 392. [l] Ibid. p. 90—93.

[m] P. 99. [n] Here I transcribe a passage from Lightfoot's Commentary upon the Acts, ch. ix. 27, of his works, Vol. I. p. 815. 'And thus,' says he, 'that persecution, that began about Stephen, had lasted 'till this very same time of Paul's coming to Jerusalem. For so it is apparent, 'both by the fear and suspiciousness of the disciples at Jerusalem, as also by 'the clausure of the text, ver. 31, "Then had the churches rest." The length 'of this persecution, by the computation of the times, as they have been cast 'up before, seemeth to have been about three years and a half.'

year 36, or the latter part of the year 35, about which time Pilate was removed after his government had been for some good while very feeble among the Jews. The same persecution reached into the year of our Lord 40, the fourth and last year of the reign of Caius; when Petronius published the orders which he had received, to set up the emperor's statue in the temple at Jerusalem: which threw the Jewish people, throughout all that country, into a general consternation, and fully employed them about their own affairs.

It seems to me therefore, from this calculation, that the persecution lasted, at least, four years. To which might be added, that it must have begun about a year before Paul's conversion, after which he was three years in Arabia. And when he returned to Jerusalem, the persecution was not at an end: nor did the peace of the churches come on till after he had been sent away from Judea to Tarsus.

2. Notwithstanding the violence, and the length of this persecution, the church of Christ was not diminished, but increased, during that period.

This may be argued from the description of the peace which succeeded it. Acts ix. 31, 32; "Then had the churches rest throughout all Judea, and Galilee, and Samaria, and were edified.——And it came to pass, as Peter passed through all quarters, he came to the saints which dwelt in Lydda." Now therefore there were churches in Judea, and Galilee, and Samaria. And I make no question, but most, or all of them, were planted during those troublesome times. For before that period we read not of any churches out of Jerusalem. And St. Paul speaking of some things after his conversion, and his return to Jerusalem, says, Gal. i. 22, "He was unknown by face to the churches of Judea, which were in Christ."

This increase of converts in those countries might be owing to several things: the patience and fortitude of the disciples: their discretion in avoiding needless offence, and in declining dangers: their zeal and intrepidity in asserting the resurrection of Jesus, and other articles of the doctrine of the gospel; the miraculous powers with which they were endowed, and their exerting them on all fit occasions.

It might be also, in part, owing to the circumstances of things. For a while, as it seems, this persecution was confined to Jerusalem, and did not extend to other parts of Judea. So says St. Luke, Acts viii. 1; "At that time was a great persecution against the church which was at Jerusalem." Paul's injuries were confined there, till he went to Damascus. He speaks not of any thing done by him against

the disciples of Jesus any where else. Acts xxvi. 10, 11; "Which thing I also did in Jerusalem.——and being exceedingly mad against them, I persecuted them even unto strange cities. Whereupon as I went to Damascus."

The persecution became more extensive afterwards. As may be gathered from those words of St. Luke, just cited: "then had the churches rest throughout all Judea, and Galilee, and Samaria." Wherein it is implied, that the believers in those countries had been disturbed: though, perhaps, the persecution was not there so violent as in Jerusalem and near it.

But so long as Paul continued in his course of opposition, the persecution either was confined to Jerusalem, or was not very violent in many other parts, if in any. This may be evidently concluded from Acts viii. 1, "And they were all scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria, except the apostles." Many of the disciples, therefore, who left Jerusalem, found shelter in Judea and Samaria. This was soon after the death of Stephen, and before Paul went to Damascus. Yea, it is added, ver. 4, 5, "Therefore they that were scattered abroad, went every where, preaching the word. Then Philip went down to the city of Samaria, and preached Christ unto them." And what follows to ver. 40, clearly showing the truth of what we are now arguing.

Moreover, it should be remembered, that the Jewish council had not the power of life and death. The death of Stephen therefore was irregular and tumultuous. That no others suffered in a like manner during this period, I would not say: considering the great conciseness of St. Luke's history, and what St. Paul says, Acts xxvi. 10, "And when they were put to death, I gave my voice against them." But if any, beside Stephen, were put to death, I apprehend not many, and those of lower rank only, none of a station in the church equal to that of Stephen. The Roman officers in Judea did not join in any part of this persecution. They had no orders so to do. And if the Jewish council had assumed authority to put men to death, it would have been complained of, and they would soon have been checked.

If the Jewish council had had the power of life and death for these four years, it would indeed have gone very hard with the christian interest, throughout the whole country of Judea: the number of believers would have been much lessened: nor could any new converts have been made. Such a persecution the church was not able to endure in its very infancy.

In like manner, a four years' persecution by Herod Agrippa would have extirpated it. All the believers in general must have perished, throughout the whole extent of his dominions, without safety to any but those who escaped into other countries. When therefore that proud and bigoted prince (whom we allow to have had supreme power throughout all the land of Israel) began to persecute the church, and had slain James, and imprisoned Peter; Providence interposed, and miraculously delivered Peter out of prison. And that prince, not observing the hand of God therein, nor being intimidated thereby, (as appears from his ordering the innocent guards to be immediately executed,) and growing still more and more proud and arrogant, he fell under the hand of God himself. Of whose death, soon after, St. Luke has left an affecting history, ch. xii. 19—23, confirmed also by[o] Josephus.

3. The first notice which we have of Paul, is in the account of Stephen's martyrdom. And it seems likely, that he had not long before made his appearance in the world.

And, if we consider Paul's situation and circumstances, we shall discern the proper vindication of his moral character. It may be reckoned probable, that he had not seen Jesus in the time of his abode on this earth. Possibly, he did not come to Judea from Tarsus, till after the period of our Lord's ministry. It may be likewise supposed, that he had not a personal acquaintance with any of Christ's apostles, nor had seen any miracles done by them, before he became a persecutor. And after that, he would not admit of instruction from the followers of Jesus. However, it is not improbable, that he saw the splendour of Stephen's countenance before the Jewish council, Acts vi. 15, as well as was witness of the wonderful patience and meekness of his death, ch. vii. 55—59. But then, as may be well supposed, he was not only prejudiced, but enraged. See ver. 54, 57, and ch. xxvi. 11.

How long he had been in Judea, and under the tuition of Gamaliel, cannot be certainly said. But it is well known, that students, whilst under the government of tutors, are strictly guarded, and much restrained. None less acquainted with what is done in the world than they. Among the ancients, especially, students of the law and philosophy were required to pay a strict regard to their masters' instructions, and theirs only. It may be supposed, then, that Paul, so long as he was with Gamaliel, knew little of the public affairs of Judea, though he was in that country.

[o] See Vol. i. p. 25—27.

Coming from the schools, animated with an earnest zeal for the law of Moses, and all its peculiarities, and for the traditions of the elders: and finding a number of men, called followers of Jesus of Nazareth, whom they spake of as the Messiah, and raised from the dead, and greater than Moses himself: he was filled with indignation, and thought he was obliged to oppose them to the utmost: which he did, till Jesus met him, and reclaimed him. It is not unlikely, that he conceived of them, as the deluded followers of an impostor, like others that appeared in Judea about that time, and therefore deserving of no regard from any wise men.

Paul says, among other humbling considerations, that he was "injurious," 1 Tim. i. 13. And he has mentioned several instances of it, Acts xxvi. 10. But even then, as we may well suppose, he would not have injured any man in his person, or property, from worldly considerations. In what he did against the followers of Jesus he was not actuated by envy, malice, covetousness, or any worldly view. It was a false zeal for God and religion, by which he was induced to be a persecutor: which in some persons, and in some circumstances, is consistent with integrity. It is very likely to have been so in Paul, a young man, little acquainted with the world, and just come fresh from the study of the law, and the Rabbinical interpretations of it. Chrysostom makes this difference between Paul and the Jews. He [p] had a sincere zeal for religion, according to his knowledge at that time. They had no concern for the welfare of Jerusalem, and aimed at nothing but their own honour.

All this has been said, for showing that Paul was sincere in what he had done, and that he did not act contrary to conviction. But[q] he cannot be justified. He should have examined. He should have taken care to be well informed. If, when he first came abroad in the world, and met with those who professed faith in Jesus, as the Messiah, he had inquired into the grounds of their persuasion: if he had attentively observed, whether they wrought any miracles, like those of Moses, and the ancient prophets, recorded in the Old Testament: if he had attended to the prophecies concerning the Messiah, which they alleged, for showing, that the character of Jesus was answerable to them, and that they were fulfilled in him; he might have received

[p] *Οὑτος μεν ȣν οὑτως εποιει, ουχ ὡς Ιȣδαιοι· μη γενοιτο. Ὁτι γαρ ζηλῳ εποιει, δηλον εκ τȣ εις τας εξω πολεις απιεναι· εκεινοι δε ουτε κἀν των Ἱεροσολυμοις εφροντισαν· αλλ' ἑνος εγενοντο μονȣ τȣ τιμης απολαυειν.* In Act. Ap. hom. 19. T. IX. p. 155. D.

[q] See Dr. Doddridge upon 1 Tim. i. 13. note *(b)* Family Expositor, Vol. V. p. 443.

satisfaction, and might have been prevented from acting that part against Jesus and his disciples, which he afterwards bewailed.

But prejudices are very strong in some. They were so in this young man. Persuaded of the divine original of the law, and of the importance of the traditions of the elders, in which he had been lately instructed, and which he had received, and held, as a most valuable branch of science, he had a sovereign contempt for this new sect, and was of opinion, that nothing could be said by them, which deserved consideration.

Such were his prejudices, that they were not to be overcome in an ordinary way. Without something more than common to awake his attention, he was in danger to have proceeded much farther in the wrong course which he was in.

But though Paul was greatly prejudiced, he was not obstinate. The Lord Jesus saw this. He knew Paul to be tractable, and open to conviction. Otherwise, he would not have met him in the way to Damascus, as he did: nor would he have called to him, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" But he well knew that those words, together with the glory of the appearance surrounding him, would change his heart, and melt him down to ready obedience.

Openness to conviction is a most necessary disposition in such weak, ignorant, fallible, sinful creatures as we are. Without it there can be no alteration for the better: no change of error for truth, or vice for virtue. Of the conceited and obstinate there is no hope. But they who are attentive to reason and argument, and are willing to be determined by evidence, may do great things. Of ignorant they may become knowing. Instead of being erroneous, they may have just sentiments. And they will proceed from one measure of knowledge and virtue to another, till they attain to great perfection in both.

This was Paul's disposition. It is very manifest in him. With what enmity against the disciples of Jesus he set out for Damascus, and how soon he was changed, the history shows. "And as he journeyed, he came near to Damascus. And suddenly there shined round about him a light from heaven. And he fell to the earth, and heard a voice saying unto him: Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" Acts ix. 3—6. Whereupon he trembles, and acquiesces. All his rage is subdued, and he becomes a disciple of Jesus.

Upon occasion of an abuse, which he received from the high priest, before whom he stood, he expressed himself

with rather too much warmth and resentment. But having been admonished of it by those who stood by, he answers with great mildness: "I wist not, I did not consider, brethren, that it was the high priest. For it is written: thou shalt not speak evil of the ruler of thy people." Acts xxiii. 1—5.

He was once offended with John Mark, because he declined a service, which he thought reasonable to be performed. Acts xiii. 13; xv. 38. But he was afterwards reconciled to him, and desired his company; persuaded, that he would be "profitable to him for the ministry," 2 Tim. iv. 11.

So much did this temper prevail in him, and so reasonable and beneficial did it appear to him, that he thought no men could be destitute of it, and that all men must be willing to hearken, and to yield to evidence. This we perceive from what he says, Acts xxii. 17—21; "When I was come again to Jerusalem, I was in a trance, and saw him, saying unto me: Make haste, and get thee quickly out of Jerusalem: for they will not receive thy testimony concerning me. And I said: Lord, they know, that I imprisoned and beat in every synagogue them that believed on thee.——And he said unto me: Depart. For I will send thee far hence unto the Gentiles." He imagined, that an account of his conversion, who once was so opposite, and the reasons of it, if fairly laid before them, must persuade them. But Jesus, who knew the hearts of all men, saw, that the people of Judea were so hardened, that nothing would work upon them. Instead therefore of labouring unprofitably among them, the Lord renewed his orders to Paul, without delay, to proceed in the work of preaching to Gentiles, as he had already begun to do.

4. It was very gracious in the Lord Jesus, to call to Paul at the time he did, and not to suffer him to continue any longer in his career of rash, and inconsiderate, and injurious zeal, without control. As yet he was tender, and tractable. Afterwards he might have been hardened: or, upon conviction, he might have sunk into despair.

5. We have reason to think, that there was an overruling Providence in disposing the person and concerns of Paul about this time, as well as in the other parts of his life.

He reflects with gratitude, that "God had separated him from his mother's womb, and called him by his grace," Gal. i. 15. There was great wisdom, as well as goodness, in the season of his call, as just shown.

It was likewise a very happy and favourable circumstance, that he did not return into Judea presently after his conver-

sion: forasmuch as the violent persecution, which began about the time of Stephen's death, had continued at least three years after Paul left Judea to go to Damascus.

It was also well for him, that he was out of Judea, during the three or four years' reign of Herod Agrippa, when he was king of all Israel. It was, indeed, owing to a violent onset of the Grecians, as they are called, that the disciples were induced to convey him to Cæsarea, and send him forth to Tarsus, Acts ix. 29, 30. But it was overruled for his good. By this means he was out of Judea, during the reign of that proud and cruel prince, which appears to have been a troublesome time to the followers of Jesus in that country, till near the end it broke out into the greatest violence. As we learn from the history in the twelfth chapter of the Acts.

IV. What was Paul's age at the time of his conversion is not certain. Witsius supposeth, that[r] he was born near the end of Herod's reign, about the same time with our Saviour. It is observable, that in the epistle to Philemon, ver. 9, written about the year of the vulgar æra 62, he calls himself Paul the aged. Which, I think, must lead us to suppose, that he was then sixty years of age, or not much less.

In the account of the martyrdom of Stephen he is called a young man, Acts vii. 58. But it is well known, that among the ancients the word youth is used with latitude.

Some things said of him about that time may induce us to think him arrived to years of maturity, or discretion. For he seems to have been one of the principal agents in the persecution of the believers after the death of Stephen: and to have been entrusted by the Jewish rulers in carrying it on. As he says to king Agrippa, Acts xxvi. 10, "Which thing I also did in Jerusalem, and many of the saints did I shut up in prison, having received authority from the chief priests." And it is well known, being[s] again and again related, that he had a commission from the high priest, when he went to Damascus. And it is also mentioned afterwards in the farther account of himself to Agrippa, ver. 12, "Whereupon as I went to Damascus with authority and commission from the chief priests." And there were several others with him at the same time, who may be supposed to

[r] At in neutram vastationem incidit pueritia Pauli, quem natum esse oportet circa mortem Herodis. Quod ita conficitur. Ipse se 'senem' fuisse docet, quando evangelii causâ vinctus Romæ detinebatur a Nerone. Philem. comm. 9. Neque tamen admodum senex eo tempore fuit, quum *νεανιας* dicatur in martyrio Stephani. Unde necesse est, ejusdem propemodum cum Christo ætatis fuisse. De Vitâ Pauli, sect. i. n. iii.

[s] See Acts ix. 1, 2, 14; xxii. 8.

have been officers under him. All which shows the regard that was paid to him.

Mr. Biscoe[t] thinks, that before his conversion Paul had been ordained elder, or rabbi, or doctor. And he supposeth, that this may enable us to account for Paul's being never excommunicated by the Jews. 'It may seem strange to 'some,' says he, 'that St. Paul was not excommunicated by 'the Jews, after he turned christian. For St. John tells 'us, ch. ix. 22, "The Jews had agreed, that if any man did 'confess, that Jesus was the Christ, he should be put out 'of the synagogue. St. Paul, notwithstanding, entered 'boldly into their synagogues, wherever he came, and 'preached that Jesus was the Christ. He was often scourg-'ed by them, 2 Cor. xi. 24. But we no where read of his 'being excommunicated. The Talmud explains this to us: 'forasmuch as thence it is abundantly evident, that they 'were very backward to excommunicate the disciples of 'the wise, the doctors, and teachers of the law.'

Whether that be certain or not, I think it may be inferred from what was before said, that at the time of his conversion, Paul was of an age when men are able to judge of the evidence of things, and to form a reasonable determination concerning their future conduct.

V. It may be now fit for us, before we proceed any farther, to consider when Paul became an apostle.

It has generally been the opinion of learned men, that Paul was called to the apostleship at the time that he was converted, or very soon after. So says [u] Spanheim, and [v] Witsius, who follows him. So likewise say divers others, who also have carefully considered this point, particularly [w] Cave, [x] Pearson, [y] Basnage. To whom I must add my late much valued friend [z] Mr. Hallet. Who, in his discourse

[t] The History of the Acts confirmed, p. 269, 270.

[u] Id vero ante omnia in disquisitionis hujus limine supponimus, idem omnino esse tempus vocationis Paulinæ ad apostolatum, quod fuit ad Christum, annum adeo eundem utriusque ac mensem. Spanh. ubi supra, sect. iv. p. 314.

[v] Quo tempore ad christianismum, eodem ad apostolatum vocatus est Paulus. Actor. ix. 15; xxiii. 15; xxvi. 17; &c. Wits. de Vit. Pauli, sect. ii. num. xxi.

[w] See before, note [p], p. 474.

[x] Tiberii 22. A. D. 36. Saülus in Arabiâ moratur, ubi per revelationem accepit plenam a Deo notitiam evangelii, ad quod prædicandum immediate vocatus est.

———A. D. 37. Saülus ex Arabiâ redit Damascum, satis in officio per revelationem instructus. Pearson. Ann. Paulin. p. 2.

[y] His peractis, Paulus, relictâ Damasco, in vicina loca aliquantisper secessit, ut ab ipso Christo αμεσως institueretur, quod et ipse tradit, Gal. i. 15—17. In eo igitur recessu non ab hominibus edoctus est, sed ab ipso Christo per revelationem didicit evangelium, et creatus est apostolus, &c. Basnag. ann. 37. num. lxii.

[z] 'From this view of the history of St. Paul's

on ordination, had occasion to consider Acts xiii. 2, 3, as well as some other texts.

That Paul was now made an apostle, and fully instructed for preaching the gospel, is evident from the account of his conversion given by the evangelist [a] Luke, and from all the accounts which he gives of himself in his discourses in Judea, to [b] the Jewish people, and [c] to Festus, and Agrippa, and from his epistle to the Galatians, and from the manner of his speaking of himself at the beginning of divers of his epistles.

What he says of himself to the Galatians, in particular, implies his having had a full knowledge of the gospel-revelation, and his being invested in the apostolical character, before the time of his first coming to Jerusalem, after his conversion. Gal. i. 11, 12, "But I certify you, brethren, that the gospel, which was preached of me, is not after men. For I neither received it of men, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ——ver. 15, 18. But when it pleased God (who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by his grace) to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the heathen, immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood: neither went I up to Jerusalem, to them which were apostles before me. But I went into Arabia, and returned again unto Damascus. Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem, to see Peter, and abode with him fifteen days."

Paul must have been an apostle, and qualified to preach the gospel, before he came to Jerusalem, and saw Peter: or what he says here cannot be reckoned material, and to the purpose about which he is speaking.

Undoubtedly, for some good while Paul preached to Jews only. And when he began to preach to Gentiles also, he may have had some farther revelations from Christ. But it does not follow that he was not an apostle before that.

'life after his conversion to christianity, it is plain, that many years (thought 'to have been ten) had passed, during which he had been a preacher, and an 'apostle, before the time mentioned, Acts xiii. At the beginning of those ten 'years, just after his conversion, Christ made him a minister and an apostle, 'and particularly gave him a commission to preach to the Gentiles, when he 'appeared to him from heaven, and said, as in Acts xxvi. 16, 17, 18. When, 'therefore, ten years after this, the prophets at Antioch separated Paul for the 'work to which he was called, by prayer, and fasting, and imposition of 'hands, it is evident they did not give him any authority. He had received 'the full apostolical authority, and that, as the apostle of the Gentiles too, long 'before this, immediately from Christ himself.' Hallet's Notes and Discourses, Vol. ii. p. 321, 322.

[a] Acts ix. 15—22.

[b] Ch. xxii. 6—15.

[c] Ch. xxvi. 13—24.

Peter, and the rest, had been apostles several years, before they were required or qualified to preach to gentiles.

Paul seldom speaks of his being an apostle, or "called to be an apostle," as he often does at the beginning of his epistles, but he seems to refer to and intend his early call, when he was converted, and put into the ministry. Rom. i. 1, "Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, separated unto the gospel of God." 1 Cor. i. 1, "Paul, called to be an apostle of Jesus Christ, through the will of God." See also 2 Cor. i. 1, but especially Gal. i. 1, "Paul, an apostle, not of men, neither by men, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead." See likewise 1 Tim. i. 12; ch. ii. 7; 2 Tim. i. 11.

One requisite qualification of an apostle appears to have been, that he should see Christ in person, and that after his resurrection. This was manifestly one privilege of the first twelve apostles, and of Matthias, chosen in the room of Judas, Acts i. 21, 22. Accordingly, we find, that Paul also, claiming the character of an apostle, speaks of his having seen Christ, and as of a well known, and uncontested thing. 1 Cor. ix. 1, "Have I not seen Jesus Christ, our Lord?" And largely in the 15th chapter of the same epistle, rehearsing divers appearances of our Lord, after his resurrection, to the apostles and others, he says, ver 8, 9, "And last of all he was seen of me also, as one born out of due time. For I am the least of the apostles, who am not worthy to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the church of God."

It is plain, then, that Paul had seen Christ, and after he was risen from the dead, as the other apostles had done. But where did he see him? It is generally[d] said, and I think

[d] Vide Wits. de Vitâ Pauli, sect. ii. num. v. vi. vii. et Basnagius, ann. 37. num. lviii.

Qu. 2. Qualis erat hæc apparitio? Resp. Indubie corporalis; quia se, ut cæteros, testem oculatum adducit. Qu. 3. Quando, et ubi Christum vidit? Resp. Dum iret Damascum. Act. ix. Obj. At Paulus tunc excœcatus erat. Resp. Prius tamen Dominum vidit, cujus maximâ claritate perstricti sunt ejus oculi, ut sit solem intuentibus. Poli Synops. ad 1 Cor. xv. 8.

Jam quod ad hanc apparitionem Dominicam Paulo factam attinet, quæ sine dubio post ascensionem Domini contigit, illud etiam indubitate tenendum est, talem fuisse quâ Christus semetipsum corporaliter atque oculis corporeis videndum Paulo ostenderet: ad quem modum et aliis omnibus supra memoratis visus est. Nam nisi talis visio fuisset etiam hæc, de quâ nunc Paulus loquitur, quomodo se perinde ut cæteros testem adduceret oculatum ad probandam veritatem resurrectionis Christi?———Nam Paulum illo tempore suæ conversionis, quum iret Damascum, non tantum audivisse Dominum loquentem, sed etiam vidisse, ex subsequenti narratione clarum est. Dicit enim ad eum Ananias, ix. 17, "Dominus misit me, Jesus qui apparuit," Græce, ὀφθείς, qui visus es', "tibi in viâ." Et cap. xxii. 14, "Deus præordinavit te, ut videres justum, et audires vocem ex ore ejus." Rursum cap ix. 27, Barnabas de eo nar-

rightly, in the way to Damascus. Then, as seems to me, Christ personally appeared to him. It is evident from St. Luke's account of Paul's conversion, Acts ix. 3—6, "And as he journeyed, he came near to Damascus, and suddenly there shined round about him a light from heaven. And he fell to the earth, and heard a voice saying unto him: Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? And he said: Who art thou, Lord? And the Lord said: I am Jesus, whom thou persecutest.——And he trembling, and astonished, said: Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto him: Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do." When Ananias by special order entered into the house where Paul was, and put his hands upon him, he said: ver. 17, "Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, who appeared to thee in the way, as thou camest, ὁ ὀφθεις σοι εν τη οδῳ, hath sent me." Compare ch. xxii. 14, and ch. ix. 27, "Barnabas brought him to the apostles, and declared unto them how he had seen the Lord in the way, and that he had spoken unto him." Paul likewise in his own accounts of his conversion uses words expressive of a personal appearance to him. So Acts xxii. 6—8, in his speech to the people of Jerusalem, where truth and exactness were very requisite. "And it came to pass, that as I made my journey, and was come nigh unto Damascus, about noon, suddenly, there shone from heaven a light round about me. And I fell to the ground, and heard a voice saying unto me: Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me. And I answered, Who art thou, Lord? And he said unto me: I am Jesus of Nazareth, whom thou persecutest." So likewise Acts xxvi. 12—19, very strong and expressive, indeed. To which the reader is referred.

If Paul did not see Jesus in person at the time of his conversion, when did he so see him? Some may say at the time mentioned, Acts xxii. 17—21.——"And it came to pass, that when I was come again to Jerusalem, even when I prayed in the temple, I was in a trance, and saw him saying unto me: Make haste, and get thee quickly out of Jerusalem: for they will not receive thy testimony concerning me."

Some think that[e] Paul had this trance when he first

rat apostolis, quomodo in viâ vidisset Dominum, et quia locutus est ei. Sed et Dominus ad Saülum prostratum, ipso referente, cap. xxvi. 16, "Ad hoc enim apparui, ωφθην, visus sum tibi, ut constituam te ministrum et testem eorum, quæ vidisti." Et quæ sequuntur. Est. in 1 Cor. xv. 8.

[e] Ver. 17, 'Retourné à Jérusalem.] Non pas d'abord. Voyez Gal. i. 17. mais après son voyage en Arabie et son séjour à Damas. Ibid. ver. 18. L'En-

came to Jerusalem, and at the end of three years after his conversion. Others rather think that[f] it happened when he and Barnabas came to Jerusalem from Antioch, with the contributions of the christians there for the support of the believers in Judea, in the time of the dearth in the reign of Claudius, and in the year of Christ 44. Of which an account is given, Acts xi. 27—30; ch. xii. 25. Others[g] hesitate.

But I cannot persuade myself, that this is what Paul intended, when he said to the Corinthians: "am I not an apostle?——Have I not seen Jesus Christ, our Lord?" nor when he says afterwards in the same epistle: "And last of all he was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time." For[h] there, as I apprehend, he must mean seeing Jesus Christ in person, waking, and with eyes open. Which is quite different from what happens in a dream, vision, trance, ecstasy.

The[i] same answer will suffice for the season of his being

fant, sur Actes xxii. 17. See likewise Dr. Doddridge upon the same place, in his Family Expositor, Vol. III. p. 355. sect. L.

[f] Et tum, opinor, Saülus raptus est in tertium cœlum, post quod tempus anno xiv. scripsit secundam ad Corinthios epistolam. cap. xii. 2. Pearson. Ann. Paulin. A. D. 44. p. 6. [g] Witsius, De Vitâ Pauli, sect. 3. num. xi. is in doubt, at which of those times Paul had this trance or vision.

[h] Saülo Damascum proficiscenti Jesum factum conspicuum, nulli dubitamus.———Nobis aperte favent Ananiæ verba, Act. ix. 17. Illud ipsum testatur Barnabas eo capite, ver. 27: sed et ipse Paulus talia voce refert, Act. xxii. 24.———Comparatum ita erat, ut nemo apostolatûs officio fungi posset, qui corporeis Christum oculis non aspexisset. Itaque in eâ collatâ sibi gratiâ exultat Paulus, atque triumphat. 'Nonne Jesum Christum Dominum 'nostrum vidi?' Quandonam porro vidit, si non vidit, dum Damascum proficisceretur? Non sane in eâ visione, cujus meminit, Act. xxii. 17—21. Fuit enim exstasis, quæ non sufficiebat apostolatui. Neque ad raptum ad tertium usque cœlum referri potest ea manifestatio, quæ apostolo necessaria; sive quia dubitat Paulus, utrum corpore fuerit, an spiritu; sive etiam quia multos ante annos munus obiit apostoli, quam mirandus ipsi raptus contigerit, &c. Basnag. A. D. 37. n. lvii. vid. et n. lviii.

[i] Quod vero multi præter visionem, quæ in viâ Damascenâ contigit, etiam mentionem huc ingerunt illius visionis, quam Paulus sibi Hierosolymam reverso, et in templo oranti narrat oblatam fuisse, Act. xxii. 17, tanquam illud respiciat hoc loco; satis illud refellitur, ex eo quod, ipso Paulo teste, exstatica fuerit illa visio; sive, ut Interpres noster vertit, 'in stupore mentis' facta. Jam autem ostendimus visionem corporalem hic intelligi debere. Sed neque ad raptum in tertium cœlum, atque in paradisum, de quo scribit, 2 Cor. xii.——— referenda est hæc visio.———Non tamen ibi scribit, se Dominum vidisse. Et, ut vidisset, nescire tamen se dicit, utrum in corpore an extra corpus ipsi raptus ille et visio contigerit: et, ut in corpore contigerit, quod est probabilius, exstaticam tamen fuisse, mente videlicet a sensibus corporeis abstractâ, convenit inter theologos. Nec, si per sensum oculorum facta fuisset ea visio, Paulus id nescire potuisset. Hic vero certum perhibet testimonium, se corporaliter, ut alios apostolos, Christum vidisse. Estius ad 1 Cor. xv. 8.

" taken up into paradise, and into the third heaven." For such things are visionary. Nor did Paul himself certainly know, whether it was " in the body, or out of the body," 2 Cor. xii. 1—3, that is, whether he was then personally transported into paradise, or whether the representation was made in his mind without any local removal. And the things, which he then saw and heard, were not to be revealed. He seldom speaks of such matters. When he does, it is not without an apology. For, as it seems, they were, chiefly, for his own encouragement under the many and great difficulties which he met with. This rapture into the third heaven and paradise had been concealed by him above fourteen years, and not mentioned at all, till now in this his second epistle to the Corinthians: as has been observed both by [k] ancients and [l] moderns. But the seeing Christ, for qualifying him to be an apostle, had been often and openly mentioned by him.

But it may be objected, that long after his conversion Paul is numbered among prophets. Acts xiii. 1, " Now there were in the church that was at Antioch certain prophets and teachers; as Barnabas, and Simeon that was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen——and Saul."

To which I answer, 1. If Paul should be allowed to be here ranked among prophets, it will not follow that he was not more than a prophet, even an apostle. St. Peter styles himself an elder, though, undoubtedly, he was also an apostle, 1 Pet. v. 1. Mr. Le Clerc has a fine observation relating to this matter in his Ecclesiastical History: that[m] though Paul is mentioned last, he was superior to the rest in point of gifts. But, says he, the first christians were not solicitous about titles and pre-eminence.

2. It is not clear, that Paul is here reckoned among prophets. He seems rather to be distinguished from them. For, very probably, it is not without some reason that Paul is not put first, nor next to Barnabas, but last of all. The

[k] *Δια τουτο και τον χρονον εθηκε των δεκατεσσαρων ετων· ουδε γαρ απλως αυτου μεμνηται, αλλα δεικνυς, ότι ουκ αν ὁ τοσουτον καρτερησας χρονον, νυν αν εξειπεν, ει μη πολλη ην αναγκη.* Chrysost. in 2 Cor. hom. 26. T. X. p. 681. D.

[l] See Dr. Doddridge's Family Expositor, Vol. IV. p. 522.

[m] Cæterum, si ex Spiritûs Sancti donis, sublimibusque revelationibus, prophetarum, doctorumque, qui memorantur, ordo conceptus esset, sine dubio, primum omnium Saülum collocari oportuisset. Sed iis temporibus nondum de primâ sede, dignitateque contentiones erant inter christianos; et qui meritis in rem christianam omnium erant primi, ii se, ex Domini præcepto, quasi minimos gerebant, nec ultimos appellari refugiebant. Cleric. H. E. A. D. 45. num. i.

meaning appears to be this, 'Now there were in the church 'at Antioch certain prophets and teachers, as Barnabas, and 'Simeon, and Lucius, and Manaen, and also Saul, whose 'character and station in the church is well known from 'the preceding history of him in this book.' Whereby indeed he evidently appears to be an apostle.

3. I add one thing more, that I may fully clear up this point. The designation, mentioned, ch. xiii. 2, 3, could not be to the apostleship. For "Paul was not an apostle of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father," Gal. i. 1. Moreover, it is here expressly said, that this ordination, or appointment, at Antioch, was to a particular work or service. "As they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul, for the work whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away." And it might be said, that[n] here is no consecration to an office, but rather a benediction for the particular work upon which they were now sent.

As Mr. Hallett says, in the place before quoted, 'They '[o] were not now separated for the work of the ministry in 'general, but were separated from the other teachers at An- 'tioch, to go abroad and propagate the gospel in other 'countries. When they went out upon this important work, 'nothing could be more agreeable, than for the church at 'Antioch to pray God to give Barnabas and Paul good suc- 'cess: which accordingly they did. They now "recom- 'mended them to the grace" or favour "of God," as St. 'Luke says, concerning this solemn transaction, ch. xiv. 26. 'And after this again, when Paul was sent abroad another 'time to preach the gospel where he had preached it before, 'he was in the same manner recommended to the grace of 'God, as it is written, ch. xv. 40, "Paul chose Silas, and 'departed, being recommended by the brethren to the grace" 'or favour "of God." Since therefore both times, when 'Paul went out from Antioch, to preach the gospel to the 'same people, the evangelist says, in the same words, that 'he was "recommended to the grace of God;" we cannot 'suppose that he was any more first made an apostle of the 'Gentiles at the former, than at the latter time of his being 'recommended.'

Upon the whole, it appears to me highly probable, from

[n] Porro, vere ut dicamus, nil ordinationis est in Antiochensium prophetarum χειροθεσιᾳ.———Eam ergo Paulus Barnabasque manuum susceperunt impositionem, quæ benedictionis est, non consecrationis. S. Basnag. ann. 45. num. iii.

[o] Vol. ii. p. 323.

all the accounts which we have of Paul's wonderful conversion, in Acts ix. xxii. and xxvi. that he received his apostolical commission from the mouth of Christ in person, when he called to him from heaven, and spoke to him in the way to Damascus. And especially does this appear from Acts xxvi. 15—20, where Paul expressly relates his commission, and the time of it, and declares, as seems to me, that all which had been hitherto done by him, in preaching the gospel to the very time when he was imprisoned, had been done in virtue of that commission. "And he said, I am Jesus, whom thou persecutest. But arise, and stand upon thy feet: for I have appeared to thee for this purpose, to make thee a minister, and a witness, both of those things which thou hast seen, and of those things in which I will appear unto thee: delivering thee from the people, and from the Gentiles, unto whom I now send thee, εις ες νυν σε αποστελλω, to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light.——Whereupon, O king Agrippa, I was not disobedient unto the heavenly vision: but showed first unto them of Damascus, and at Jerusalem, and throughout all the coasts of Judea, and then to the Gentiles; that they should repent and turn to God, and do works meet for repentance."

This also exactly suits the manner in which the other apostles were appointed. They were apostles from the time that Jesus Christ called them to attend upon him. See Matt. iv. 18—22; Luke vi. 13. And he often discoursed to them concerning their commission in its full extent, and the difficulties they would meet with in the discharge of it: giving them also various directions relating to their conduct, when they should come abroad in the world. See Matt. x. throughout, and xvi. 18, 19, and many like places in the other gospels. And before he left them, he expressly said: "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations," Matt. xxviii. 19. But they did not at first understand the full extent of their commission, nor presently execute it. At the first they preached to Jews only. And it was several years after Christ's ascension before they preached to Gentiles. So Paul was from the beginning called, and appointed to be an apostle: and by degrees he was qualified for it as his commission opened. And in time he was called out by Divine Providence to the full execution of it. But all along he was an apostle, and acted and taught as such: first preaching to Jews at Damascus, and Jerusalem, and Judea, and other parts, and then to Gentiles. So he plainly says to Agrippa in the place recited just now.

VI. Having thus settled the time of Paul's conversion and apostleship according to the best of my ability, I now intend to give an account of his travels in the service of the gospel. This I do for the sake of showing the date of his writings. And it would be shorter, and more agreeable on divers accounts, to take in his epistles as we go along. But there being debates about the time of several of them, I think it will be preferable to write his history, without interruption, as briefly as we can, and then observe the order of his epistles.

Paul, having been baptized by Ananias at Damascus, stayed a short time with the disciples there, and then went into Arabia: where, it is very likely, he might meet with some believers. For Arabians are expressly mentioned, Acts ii. 11, among the Jews and proselytes, who heard the apostle Peter's first sermon at Jerusalem after the descent of the Holy Ghost. At which time many were converted to a faith in Jesus Christ. Acts ii. 41.

Whilst Paul was in Arabia, it is reasonable to think, that he was fully instructed, by special[p] revelation, in the doctrine preached by Jesus Christ, when here on earth, and all the things said and done by him, and his sufferings, crucifixion, resurrection, and ascension, the fulfilment of the ancient prophecies in Jesus, the Christ, the Son of David, and the Son of Abraham, and received also the Holy Ghost, in a measure equal to that of other apostles. Whereby he was qualified to preach the gospel, and to testify the resurrection of Jesus, and to prove him to be the Christ, without receiving either instruction or gifts from other apostles.

Having been some time in Arabia, he returned to Damascus, "And straightway he preached in the synagogues, that Jesus is the Christ," or "the Son of God." This he did with such strength and cogency of argument, as to "confound the Jews, which dwelt at Damascus." They being greatly provoked, and forming a design upon his life, the disciples found means to provide for his escape. Whereupon he went to Jerusalem, Acts ix. 20—25.

Some think that Paul preached at Damascus soon after he had been baptized by Ananias, and that he also preached in Arabia, and that[q] he had preached three years, before he came to Jerusalem after his conversion. Pearson[r] supposeth

[p] Concerning the manner of the revelations now vouchsafed to Paul, may be seen Lightfoot in his Comm. upon Acts ix. 1, in the first volume of his works, p. 791.

[q] Il veut montrer, qu'il avoit prêché l'évangile trois ans avant que d'avoir vu aucun Apôstre, &c. Beaus. sur Galat. i. 18.

[r] Saülus in Arabiâ moratur, ubi per revelationem accepit plenam a Deo notitiam evangelii, ad quod prædicandum immediate vocatus est.

that Paul, whilst in Arabia, received by revelation, a full knowledge of the gospel. And says, that when he returned from Arabia to Damascus, he preached there. But I do not perceive him to say, that Paul preached in Arabia, or at Damascus, presently after his conversion.

To me it seems, that Paul did not preach at Damascus presently after he had been baptized, but first went into Arabia, and then returned to Damascus. And being now qualified by divine revelation, and by diligent reading the scriptures of the Old Testament, during his recess in Arabia, and being fully determined, after a competent time of humiliation for past conduct, and serious meditation, in which he had well weighed the difficulties of the work he was entering upon, he began to preach Christ in the synagogues of Damascus. I am confirmed in this opinion by the interpretation of an author, whose words I place [s] below. Nor does St. Paul, that I remember, any where say, that he preached in Arabia. He makes a large, and, seemingly, very particular enumeration of places and people, to whom he had preached, in his discourse before Agrippa, without taking any notice of Arabia. Acts xxvi. 20, "I showed first unto them of Damascus, and at Jerusalem, and throughout all the coasts of Judea, and then to the Gentiles, that they should repent, and turn to God."

Jerom observing, that St. Luke had said nothing of Paul's being in Arabia, is inclined to think that [t] he did not discharge any part of his apostolical office in that country.

Saülus ex Arabiâ redit Damascum, satis in officio per revelationem instructus. Annal. Paulin. A. D. 36, 37, p. 2.

[s] 'St. Paul, being restored to his sight by Ananias, stayed not long at Damascus, but retired forthwith into Arabia, as he himself tells us, Gal. i. 16, 17. 'Whereas it is said, Acts ix. 19, 20, "And when he had received meat, he 'was strengthened. Then was Saul certain days with the disciples at Damas-'cus, and straightway he preached Christ in the synagogues." Here the word, '"straightway," does not relate to Saul's first coming to Damascus, but to his 'return thither, after he had been in Arabia. For Acts ix. 19, 20, are to be 'rendered and paraphrased thus: "And, when he had received meat, he was 'strengthened." Presently after which, according to Gal. i. 16, he went into 'Arabia, and, having been there instructed in the gospel by the revelation of 'Jesus Christ, according to Gal. i. 12, he returned again to Damascus. "Then," 'or "now, was Paul certain days with the disciples at Damascus, and straight-'way," namely, after his return out of Arabia, "he preached Christ in the 'synagogues." Dr. Edw. Wells's Historical Geography of the N. T. Part II. p. 20, 21.

[t] Lucam vero ideirco de Arabiâ præterîsse, quia forsitan nihil dignum apostolatu in Arabiâ perpetrârat: et ea potius compendiosa narratione dixisse, quæ digna Christi evangelio videbantur. Nec hoc segnitiæ apostoli deputandum, si frustra in Arabiâ fuerit; sed quod aliqua dispensatio et Dei præceptum fuerit, ut taceret. Hieron. in Gal. i. 17. T. IV. P. I. p. 235.

But then, if Paul was silent there, he thinks it was not owing to the apostle's backwardness to speak: but the divine wisdom appointed that it should be so.

Theophylact observes, that [u] the design of the Jews at Damascus to destroy Paul, was not formed presently after his conversion to the faith: but after his return thither from Arabia, at the end of three years, just before his going to Jerusalem.

Indeed, it is very likely, that if Paul had preached at Damascus, soon after his first arrival there, he would have met with a most violent onset. And as nothing of that kind is particularly taken notice of, it may be concluded, that he did not then publicly preach in any synagogues: nor was it fit, or becoming, that he should. It was highly proper, that some time should be allotted for retirement, after such a course, as he had been in, before he began to preach and teach publicly in the name of Jesus.

Though St. Luke has not mentioned the journey into Arabia, nor the time of Paul's absence from Damascus, he knew it very well, and has hinted it, saying, "And after many days were fulfilled, the Jews took counsel to slay him," Acts ix. 23.

Mr. Beausobre says, that [v] Paul's journey into Arabia should be placed between ver. 22 and 23, of the ninth chapter of the Acts. I should rather place it between ver. 19 and 20, of that chapter.

This period of three years, or three years and somewhat more, from Paul's conversion to his coming to Jerusalem, reaches, according to our computation, from near the end of the year 36, to near the end of 39, or the beginning of the year 40, or from the beginning of the year 37, to the former part of the year 40.

I cannot allow myself to speak positively, where there is not the evidence of certainty. I do not know in what month Paul was converted, or came to Jerusalem. Of such things as these it is sufficient to say, that they happened in such a year, or thereabout.

VII. Paul having been full three years at Damascus, and in its neighbourhood, and in Arabia, he came to Jerusalem. Gal. i. 18, "And when he was come thither, he essayed to join himself to the disciples: but they were all afraid of him, and believed not that he was a disciple," Acts ix. 26.

[u] ——ὁτι ἡ επιβȣλη εν Δαμασκῳ ȣκ ευθεως μετα το πιϛευσαι γεγονεν αλλα μετα το ανελθειν αυτον απο Αραβιας μετα ετη τρια. Και οὑτως γεγονεν ἡ προς τα Ἱεροσολυμα ανοδος. Theoph. in Act. Ap. p. 94.

[v] Comment. sur Gal. i. 17.

This may seem strange to some. But now we discern the reason of it from the account that has been lately given of the continuance of the persecution in Judea, after the death of Stephen, and also of Paul's retired way of life, for some while, in Arabia. Paul had but lately begun to preach openly in the name of Jesus, in the synagogues of Damascus. And [w] the believers in Judea being much harassed by the persecution which they met with at home, had not received any intelligence about what had passed at Damascus, and in the way thither. Nor were the Jewish rulers forward to publish the loss of so active a servant as Paul had been.

Acts ix. 27—30, "But Barnabas took him, and brought him to the apostles, and declared unto them, how he had seen the Lord in the way, and how he had preached boldly at Damascus."

There have been different conjectures concerning the reasons, why Barnabas, in particular, brought Paul to the apostles. Some have imagined that [x] he and Barnabas had studied together under Gamaliel: or [y] at least, that they had been acquainted formerly. But I see no ground for such a supposition in the history. If that had been the case, there would have been some intimation of it; which there is not. I therefore rather think, that it was entirely owing to the circumstances of things. When Paul came to Jerusalem, it was a time of persecution, as before observed, and the apostles lived privately. Paul endeavoured to join himself to the disciples, and be acquainted with them: but they were all shy of him. And possibly they were desirous that he should be approved by some of the apostles, before they took notice of him. However, he met with Barnabas,

[w] Says Lightfoot, in his Commentary upon Acts ix. 26. Vol. I. p. 814, 'Some cannot conceive how it should be possible, that he should have been a 'convert three years, and yet his conversion and present qualities should be 'unknown to the church at Jerusalem. But these two or three considerations 'may help the scruple. 1. The distance between Damascus and Jerusalem. '2. The persecution that continued still upon the church of Judea, which 'would keep the disciples of Damascus from going thither. And, 3. The just 'fear that might possess the disciples at Jerusalem, in the very time of persecu-'tion. For though it was said before, that the church of Jerusalem, and of 'Judea, enjoyed a great deal of rest and tranquillity after the conversion of 'Paul, their great persecutor, in comparison of what they had done before, yet 'was not the persecution of the church utterly extinct to the very time of 'Paul's coming up to Jerusalem, but continued still. And therefore it is the 'less wonder, if the disciples there be the more fearful and cautelous.'

[x] On prétend, qu'il avoit étudié avec Saül sous Gamaliel. L'Enfant, sur Actes, ix. 27. See also Pool's English Annotations upon the place.

[y] Forte Barnabas Saülum ante conversionem noverat, credebatque ei ut minime mendaci. Grot. ad loc.

and gave him an account of his conversion, and of every thing that had happened to him since he went from Jerusalem. And Barnabas gave credit to his account. Nor is it impossible, but that some believers might come from Damascus, and confirm the truth of it. Whereupon Barnabas was willing to introduce him to the apostles. Unquestionably, they placed full confidence in Barnabas, and he might know where they were. However, it is evident he had access to James. To him he brought Paul: and James brought him to Peter: so Paul had communion with all the apostles. After which he was readily received by the disciples, or believers in general. "And he was with them, coming in and going out at Jerusalem. And he spake boldly in the name of the Lord Jesus, and disputed with the Grecians," or Greeks: meaning proselytes to the Jewish religion, in whom we see the true spirit of the Jewish proselytes about this time, as declared by our Saviour himself, Matt. xxiii. 15, "But they went about to slay him. Which when the brethren knew, they brought him down to Cæsarea, and sent him forth to Tarsus."

By Cæsarea I should be apt to understand "Cæsarea by the sea side," mentioned before, ch. viii. 40. But some learned men, particularly [z] Witsius, and [a] Dr. Doddridge, hereby suppose to be intended Cæsarea Philippi. If we could be assured of that interpretation, perhaps it might lead us to the meaning of that expression of Paul in his speech to Agrippa, cited not long ago: "throughout all the coasts of Judea." And indeed it may be reckoned probable, that therein Paul refers to what was now done by him. For we cannot think of any more likely season for it, considering how short a stay he generally made in Judea, whenever he came thither after his conversion. It is very probable, that as he travelled with the disciples, who accompanied him, he was not silent. Though he made no long stay in any one place, he would embrace every opportunity that offered, to speak of the doctrine, which now lay with so much weight on his mind.

"The brethren," as St. Luke says, "brought him down to Cæsarea, and sent him forth to Tarsus." And St. Paul

[z] ———Hierosolymam reliquit, et a fratribus Cæsaream deductus est, non maritimam illam, quæ et Turris Stratonis dicta, de quâ supra cap. viii. 40, sed Cæsaream Philippi, quæ sita erat circa montem Libanum, ad confluentem Jor et Dan, unde Jordanes originem ducit, quæ olim Lachis, deinde Dan appellata fuit, de quâ Jud. xviii. Cujus pomœria quum rex Agrippa protulisset, mutato nomine in honorem Neronis vocavit Neroniada. Joseph. Antiq. 20. viii. Wits. de Vitâ Pauli, sect. 3. n. ii.

[a] See the Family Expositor, Vol. III. p. 146. upon Acts ix. 30.

himself says, Gal. i. 21, "Afterwards I came into the regions of Syria and Cilicia." Tarsus was now the chief city of Cilicia, and Paul's native place: where he had not been since he first came up to Jerusalem, to study the law under Gamaliel. Possibly, Paul now found some of his relations, and likewise some others, who were disciples of Jesus before him. See Rom. xvi. 7, 11. Possibly also, while he travelled now in these countries of Cilicia and Syria, he met with some of those dangers and difficulties, which are entirely omitted by St. Luke, but are mentioned or hinted by the apostle in his epistles, especially the eleventh chapter of the second epistle to the Corinthians.

In those countries Paul was the remainder of the year 40, and all 41, and likewise all 42, or the greatest part of it, till about the beginning of the year 43, preaching, undoubtedly, in the name of Jesus to native Jews, and to proselytes of the Jewish religion.

Afterwards he went to Antioch, and began to preach to Gentiles, as we shall see presently.

The churches having peace, and being no longer disturbed by a violent persecution, Peter visited the disciples in the several parts of Judea, Acts ix. 32—43. Before he returned to Jerusalem, whilst he was in the city of Joppa, "where he tarried many days," he received an order from heaven to go to Cæsarea. And in ch. x. and xi. 1—18, St. Luke gives a distinct account of St. Peter's going to the house of Cornelius at Cæsarea, and there preaching to Gentiles, and of the defence which he made of his conduct to the apostles and brethren at Jerusalem, and their acquiescence therein, upon which I do not now enlarge.

Afterwards, at ver. 19, 20, St. Luke says, "Now they which were scattered abroad upon the persecution that arose about Stephen, travelled as far as Phenice, and Cyprus, and Antioch, preaching the word to Jews only. And some of them were men of Cyprus and Cyrene: who when they were come to Antioch, spake unto the Grecians, preaching the Lord Jesus."

These men had preached the gospel to Jews, and the proselytes to judaism, in Phenice, and Cyprus, and Antioch. But some time after their arrival at Antioch, hearing of Peter's having opened the door of the kingdom of heaven to Gentiles at the house of Cornelius, they began to preach also to the Greeks at Antioch, that is, the [b] people of the

[b] ——— 'that is, the people of the country,' Acts xix. 10.———'so that all they which dwelt in Asia, heard the word of the Lord Jesus, both Jews and Greeks.' And ver. 17. 'And this was known to all the Jews and Greeks also

country: who might, possibly, some few of them, be pious men like Cornelius, who even before his conversion was a worshipper of the true God, the God of Israel: but the greatest part of them must have been heathen idolaters, as all the people of the earth, except the Jews, generally were, till the coming of Christ, and the preaching of his gospel [c] among them.

Ver. 21. "And the hand of the Lord was with them." God graciously accompanied their ministry with miraculous works, which he enabled them to perform in the name of Jesus." Whereby they who saw them were awakened and convinced. And those evangelists likewise were greatly encouraged, being thereby fully satisfied, that what they did was approved by God himself. "And a great number believed and turned unto the Lord."

Ver. 22—26. Then tidings of these things came unto the ears of the church, which was at Jerusalem: and they sent forth Barnabas, that he should go as far as Antioch. Who when he came, and had seen the grace of God, was glad, and exhorted them all, that with purpose of heart they should cleave unto the Lord. "Then departed Barnabas to Tarsus, for to seek Saul. And when he had found him he brought him unto Antioch."

VIII. If Peter preached to Cornelius, in the year 41, and about the middle of that year, as is probable, it would be near the end of the year 42, or the beginning of the year 43, when Paul was brought by Barnabas to Antioch.

During this time of Paul's being at Antioch, in the year of Christ 43, he might have the rapture, mentioned by him 2 Cor. xii. It seems to me to have happened soon after he came to Antioch, when he first began to preach to Gentiles, who hitherto had preached to Jews only.

Ver. 26. "And it came to pass, that a whole year they assembled themselves with the church and taught much

dwelling at Ephesus.' It is common with all authors about that time, to call the people, who inhabited the cities of Asia and Syria, Greeks. Οἱ δε μετ' αυτον——παντα τοις επ' Αντιοχειας Ιεδαιοις απεδοσαν,——και συνεχωρησαν αυτοις εξ ισε της πολεως τοις Ἑλλησι μετεχειν. Jos. de B. J. l. 7. cap. 3. n. 3. p. 1299. Hudson. Iter igitur ita per Asiam feci.—Nullo judicio, nullâ contumeliâ, auctoritate et cohortatione perfeci, ut et Græci, et cives Romani, qui frumentum compresserant, magnum numerum populis pollicerentur. Cic. ad Att. l. 5. ep. 21. et passim.

[c] Ut ut sit, Gentiles hic intelligi, res ipsa clamat. Atque hoc primum exemplum est evangelii publice Gentibus prædicati. Nam alterum illud Cornelii non nisi domesticum fuit. Quum vero Dei favorem in sancto hoc opere insigniter experirentur fideles illi Cyprii ac Cyrenenses, multusque Græcorum numerus, fide ipsis habitâ, converteretur ad Christum, non potuit tantæ rei fama Hierosolymitanæ ecclesiæ proceres diu latere. Wits. de Vitâ Paul. sect. 3. n. iii.

people; and the disciples were called christians first at Antioch."

This whole year, I think, must be part of the years 43 and 44, according to the vulgar computation. It may have reached some way into the year 44. Indeed, I apprehend the whole year, mentioned by Luke, to have expired not long before the time that Paul and Barnabas went up to Jerusalem, with the contributions made at Antioch, for the relief of the believers in Judea in the approaching famine. For that is what St. Luke immediately proceeds to relate in ver. 27—30, that is, to the end of the chapter. And in this year, 44, I suppose the believers in Jesus to have obtained this denomination.

"And the disciples were called christians." Which [d] some think to have been done by a divine admonition. And they translate after this manner: "And [e] the disciples were by divine appointment first named christians at Antioch."

Witsius [f] does not discern any particular emphasis in the word, and readily admits the interpretation of Grotius, that the Greek word, according to its usual meaning in the best Greek writers, and in the New Testament itself, signifies named, or called. And he inclines to the conjectures of Abp. Usher, that this appellation was given to the believers by the Romans, then at Antioch.

Suicer in his Thesaurus explains [g] the original word, and understands this text exactly as Grotius did.

Dr. Heumann has [h] a Dissertation concerning the origin of the name of christians. Wherein [i] he largely shows it

[d] See Dr. Benson's History of the first Planting the Christian Religion, Vol. i. ch. 1. sect. vi. p. 241. first ed. p. 248. second ed.

[e] That is Dr. Doddridge's translation. Family Expositor, Vol. iii. p. 178.

[f] Quod nomen Latinâ non Græcâ formâ a Christo deflexum, a Romanis Antiochiæ degentibus impositum illis fuisse, conjectat in Annalibus suis Usserius. Nec desunt, qui emphasin quærant in voce *χρηματισαι*, quâ Lucas utitur. Scilicet talem volunt nominationem eo vocabulo designari, quæ publico edicto, ei jussu Reipublicæ fit.———Non invideo sane observationes istas doctissimis auctoribus suis, modo mihi dubitare liceat, an tam solidæ quam subtiles sint. Simplicior videtur annotatio Grotii: *χρηματιζειν*, pro nominari, est vox melioris Græcitatis, quam et Polybius non semel usurpat, et Paulus, Rom. vii. 3. *αρα ουν ζωντος τȣ ανδρος μοιχαλις χρηματισει.* Ubi hæc jactata vocis emphasis? Wits. ubi supr. sect. 3. num. iv.

[g] *Χρηματιζω* significat nominor, vocor, appellor. Ita sumitur Acts xi. 26.———'Factum est autem, ut primum Antiochiæ discipuli nominarentur vel appellarentur Christiani.' *Χρηματισαι* hic est *ονομοσθηναι, προσαγορευθηναι, λεχθηναι, κληθηναι.* Suicer.

[h] De Ortu Nominis Christianorum. Diss. xi. ap. Primit. Gotting. p. 130—147.

[i] Satis nunc cognovimus, Christianorum appellationis auctores fuisse non ipsos Christi cultores, sed ethnicos.——Illud præterea hinc discimus, Latinum potius esse nomen Christianorum, quam Græcum. Ac proinde facile subscribimus sententiæ Usserii, in Annalibus suis

to be very probable, that this name had not its rise from the Jews. Nor did the disciples of Jesus take it to themselves. But probably, they were first so called by heathens, particularly the Romans: as Abp. Usher had argued, the name not having a Greek, but a Latin termination.

This will overthrow the observation of Chrysostom, formerly [k] mentioned, 'That St. Paul gave us this name.' And indeed Dr. Heumann shows, that both [l] St. Luke, and [m]

pronuntiantis: 'Nomen christianorum Latinâ non Græcâ formâ a Christo deflexum, a Romanis Antiochiæ tum degentibus impositum illis fuisse videtur.' Nec rex Agrippa, Act. xxvi. 28, appellatione christianorum utens, cum esset in domo Festi, Romani præsidis, alio credi potest nomine usus esse, quam quod usurpabant Romani. Ac certe in universâ Laërtii Historiâ Philosophorum Græcorum, ne una quidem secta occurrit, cujus nomen terminationem *anus* nactum sit; neque e. g. Platoniani dicuntur Platonis asseclæ, uti Ciceronianos dixissent Latini et Catonianos, sed Platonici.———Illud adjicio, etiam Herodianis hoc nomen imposuisse non Græcos aut Judæos, sed Romanos. Heum. ib. num. ix. p. 140.

[k] See Vol. iv. p. 557.

[l] Nec vero solum non probari potest, primum usos esse christianorum appellatione Christi discipulos; verum etiam gravibus id negari potest argumentis. ———Primum enim Lucam sequentibus in capitibus hujus sui libri uti oportuisset hac appellatione, si christiani Antiocheni hoc nomen ipsi sibi imposuissent. Jam vero id ne semel quidem ab eo factum est; sed, uti antea christianæ religionis professores modo μαθητας vocavit, cap. i. 15; vi. 1, 2, 7; ix. 1, 10, 19, 25, 26, 36; modo αδελφες, ix. 30; x. 23; xi. 1, 12; semel etiam τες πιστευσαντας, iv. 32; ac semel τες ἁγιες, ix. 32; sic post mentionem de ortu nominis christianorum eos semel appellavit τες πεπιστευκοτας, xxi. 25; cæteris in locis aut μαθητας, xi. 29; xiii. 52; xiv. 20, 28; xvi. 1; xviii. 23, 27; xix. 1, 9; xx. 1, 7, 30; xxi. 4, 16; aut αδελφες, xi. 29; xii. 17; xv. 1, 3, 22, 23, 32, 33, 40; xvi. 2, 40; xvii. 6, 10, 14; xviii. 18; xxi. 7, 17; xxviii. 14, 15. Ubi supr. num. vi. p. 137.

[m] Deinde, si eo tempore, quo Paulus Antiochiæ docuit, Christi discipuli hoc nomen suâ sponte adscivissent, dubitari non potest, quin is apostolus usurpaturus hanc appellationem fuisset suis in epistolis. Semper autem alio is utitur nomine. In exordiis solet eos τες ἁγιες vocare. Nactus quoque opportunam occasionem eos appellandi τες χριστιανες, ex. gr. Rom. viii. 9; Gal. v. 24, tamen dicere maluit τες τε Χριστε. Imo, cum Agrippa, Act. xxvi. 28, ad ipsum hanc vocem edidisset: 'Prope abest, ut et 'ego fiam' χριστιανος' quasi refugiens appellationem hanc, non ita respondet; 'Vellem fias christianus,' sed hisce verbis: 'Vellem fias talis, qualis ego sum.' Notabilis et ille locus Gal. i. 22.———At non ait ibi Paulus: ταις εκκλησιαις χριστιαναις, sed ταις εν Χριστῳ. Eodem modo, 1 Tim. v. 16, ubi dicere poterat, 'si quis christianus vel christiana mulier,' ita locutus est: ει τις πιστος η πιστα. Jam si ecclesia ipsa auctor fuisset hujus appellationis, an eâ tam studiose abstinere potuisse Paulum, credi potest? Memini, etiam, Isidorum Pelusiotam, olim hanc proposuisse quæstionem, lib. IV. ep. 61. Cur nusquam Paulus nomen usurparit χριστιανε, nihil autem ad eam respondisse. Nos vero videmur nobis justissimâ responsione defuncti esse. Ibid. num. vii. p. 138.

Nomine illo christianorum nec Paulum usquam nec Lucam usum esse, cum supra observaverimus, nunc disceptemus, age, cur hic apostolus, unâ cum ministro suo socioque sacri itineris id fecerit: cur item non ita multo post in civitatem christianam recepta fuerit ea appellatio. Abstinuisse scilicet eâ hanc ob causam videtur Paulus, ne Christus hoc pacto in ordinem redigeretur doctorum sapientiæ των φιλανθρωπων, cum sit θεανθρωπος, &c. Ib. num. xi. p. 142.

St. Paul seem to have declined the use of it: possibly, lest our Saviour should have been esteemed an ordinary leader of a sect, like the philosophers at that time much celebrated among the Greeks and Romans.

However, it was not long before it obtained, and was very acceptable to the followers of Jesus. It is used by St. Peter, 1 ep. iv. 16. And some[n] have thought it to be the "worthy name," intended by St. James, ch. ii. 7. And it is certain, that afterwards it was much and justly valued by those who bore it. In the epistle of the churches of Vienne and Lyons, giving an account of their late sufferings, it is styled [o] an honourable, and glorious, and reviving appellation.

It may be hence concluded, that the believers at Antioch were now numerous. Otherwise, heathen people had not taken so much notice of them. And indeed St. Luke had before said, that when the men of Cyprus and Cyrene "were come to Antioch, and spoke to the Greeks, preaching the Lord Jesus, the hand of the Lord was with them, and a great number believed, and turned unto the Lord," ver. 20, 21; and that upon the coming of Barnabas, and his preaching there, "much people was added unto the Lord," ver. 24. It is reasonable to suppose, that after Paul came thither, farther additions were made, at which time they received this new name.

It follows, Acts xi. 27—30, "And in those days came prophets from Jerusalem unto Antioch. And there stood up one of them, named Agabus, and signified in the spirit, that there should be great dearth throughout all the world." [Or all the land, meaning Judea.] "Which came to pass in the days of Claudius Cæsar. Then the disciples, every man according to his ability, determined to send relief to the brethren who dwelt at Judea. Which also they did. And sent it to the elders by the hands of Barnabas and Saul."

Then follows in the twelfth chapter an account of the persecution, and death of Herod Agrippa: in the last verse of which chapter it is said: "And Barnabas and Saul returned from Jerusalem, when they had fulfilled their ministry. And they took with them John, whose surname was Mark."

Ad ultimum non dubitabant ipsimet christiani pervulgato uti hoc nomine. ——Cujus rei etsi unum duntaxat exemplum in N. T. codice, in prioris videlicet Petri epistolæ capite quarto, unum tamen illud exemplum est instar sexcentorum. Ib. num. xii. p. 142, 143.

[n] Vid. Grot. et Wolf. Curæ in loc.

[o] —— *την παντιμον, και ενδοξον, και ζωοποιον προσηγοριαν.* Ap. Euseb. H. E. l. 5. cap. 1. p. 160. D. Vid. et p. 158. A.

Of this famine we spoke [p] formerly. And as Agrippa died in 44, and Barnabas and Paul seem not to have performed this service, nor to have returned to Antioch, until after his death, it was argued, that this commission of the church of Antioch was not finished by them till near the end of that year.

At this time of Paul's being at Jerusalem, in the year 44, I suppose, he had the trance mentioned by him in his speech to the Jewish people, Acts xxii. 17—21. For it was in that city, and in the temple, as he expressly says: "And it came to pass, that when I was come again to Jerusalem, even while I was praying in the temple, I was in a trance.—— And he said unto me: Depart. For I will send thee far hence unto the gentiles." And we shall presently see, that soon after this Paul and Barnabas left Antioch, and made a farther progress in preaching the gospel to gentile people.

I suppose this period to be about two years, from the time of Paul's coming first to Antioch, and beginning to preach there to gentiles, to his return thither again, after he had been at Jerusalem upon the commission above mentioned: that is, from near the end of the year 42, or from the beginning of the year 43, to the end of the year 44.

IX. I now intend to take in the history of Paul and Barnabas from that time to their coming again to Jerusalem, and returning thence to Antioch.

Says St. Luke, Acts xiii. 1—3, "Now there were in the church, that is, at Antioch, certain prophets, and teachers, as Barnabas, and Simeon, and Lucius, and Manaen, and Saul. And as they ministered unto the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said: Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted, and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away."

Pearson supposeth, that [q] at this time, which, according to his computation, was the year 44, Paul had the rapture mentioned by him, 2 Cor. xii. 1—4. But first, I suppose it to have been now the year 45, where also this mission is placed by [r] Basnage. Secondly, that rapture must have happened before the year 44. The second epistle to the Corinthians was written, according [s] to Pearson, in the year

[p] See Vol. i. p. 252—259.

[q] Dum ibi prophetæ et doctores ministrarent Domino, Saülus et Barnabas segregati ab illis sunt in opus ad quod assumsit eos Spiritus Sanctus. Acts xiii.

Et tum, opinor, Saülus raptus est in tertium cœlum, post quod tempus anno xiv. scripsit secundam ad Corinthios epistolam, xii. 2. Pearson. Ann. Paulin. p. 6. ad ann. Claudii 4. ær. vulg. 44.

[r] Ann. 45. num. iii. iv. &c.

[s] Annal. Paulin. p. 15.

57. St. Paul's expression, speaking of this rapture, is above fourteen years ago. Which [t] will carry us back to the fifteenth year, consequently, to the year of Christ 43, for the soonest. At which time I suppose Paul was come to Antioch, and was beginning to preach the gospel there to gentiles, together with Barnabas. Basnage [u] placeth this rapture in the year 41.

Acts xiii. 4, "So they, being sent forth by the Holy Ghost, departed unto Seleucia, and thence sailed to Cyprus."

Antioch upon the Orontes was the capital city of Syria. Seleucia was a city lying about twelve miles lower upon the same river, a port upon the Mediterranean sea, a few miles above the mouth of the Orontes. There Paul and Barnabas took shipping, and sailed to Cyprus, which lay westward. They went ashore at Salamis, a city at the east end of the island. Where finding Jewish synagogues, "they preached the word of the Lord to them." After which they went through the island to Paphos, at the west end, where was the seat of the proconsul. His name was Sergius Paulus: who sent for Barnabas and Saul, desiring to hear the word of God. He being a man well disposed, and seeing the miracle wrought by Saul upon Elymas the sorcerer, whom he smote with blindness for a season, believed or embraced the doctrine of the gospel, taught by Saul and Barnabas. And henceforward St. Luke writes the apostle's name Paul, whom he had hitherto called Saul.

It may be thought, that the chief reason of their going now to Cyprus, was, that it was the native country of Barnabas, as we know from Acts iv. 36. But beside that, I imagine, there was another reason, and more influencing. For we perceive, that some of them who left Jerusalem upon account of the persecution that followed the death of Stephen, were men of Cyprus, and had been there preaching to Jews only, as well as at Antioch. And it might be reckoned very proper, when the gospel was to be preached to Gentiles, as well as to Jews, that these special messengers should go directly to a country where an address had been already made to Jews: and where some of them, as may be reasonably supposed, had been converted to the faith of the gospel.

Leaving Paphos, they came back to the continent, and

[t] 'That rapture, or trance, was somewhat above fourteen years before he wrote his second epistle to Corinth, 2 Cor. xii. 2. Now in that he saith, it was *προ ετων*, before, or above fourteen years ago, he speaketh not of an indefinite time,———but that it was a little above that space, though it were somewhat above exact fourteen years,' &c. Lightfoot, Vol. I. p. 792.

[u] Vid. Ann. 41. num. xxi. xxii.

landed at Perga in Pamphylia. Where Mark, who hitherto had accompanied them, left them, and returned to Jerusalem.

From Perga they went to Antioch, the chief city of Pisidia, lying north of Pamphilia. St. Luke has given a large account of Paul's discourse in the Jewish synagogue there, and the success of it, Acts xiii. 14—52. From Antioch they went to Iconium, the chief city of Lycaonia. Where they also taught in the Jewish synagogue: "So that a great multitude both of the Jews and also of the Greeks believed." Many miracles likewise were wrought by their hands, during their stay in that city, xiv. 1—4. But at length a design being formed, both by Jews and gentiles, and their rulers, to stone them to death, and they receiving intelligence of it, when it was almost ripe for execution, went thence, and preached the gospel at "Lystra, and Derbe, cities of Lycaonia, and in the region round about," ver. 6, 7; meaning, perhaps, Isauria, sometimes reckoned a part of Lycaonia. At Lystra, Paul healed a man lame from his birth. Which raised great admiration in the people. And, if not restrained, they would have offered a sacrifice to Paul and Barnabas. Nevertheless, by artifices of unbelieving Jews, who came thither from Antioch and Iconium, the minds of the people were soon changed, and they "stoned Paul, and dragged him out of the city, supposing he had been dead. Howbeit, as the disciples," who had not left him, "stood round about him, he rose up, and came into the city. And the next day he departed with Barnabas to Derbe. Where having preached the gospel, and taught many, they returned again to Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch, confirming the disciples" there, "and exhorting them to continue in the faith, and letting them know, that we must, through much tribulation, enter into the kingdom of God. And when they had ordained them elders in every city, they commended them to the Lord, on whom they had believed." From Antioch they went to Pamphylia. "And when they had preached the word in Perga," where they had been before, but probably made no stay, "they went down to Attalia," a maritime city of the same country. "Thence they sailed to Antioch, whence they had been recommended to the grace of God, for the work which they had fulfilled. And when they were come, and had gathered the church together, they rehearsed all that God had done with them, and how he had opened the door of faith unto the gentiles. And there they abode long time with the disciples," ver. 8—28.

For this journey Pearson [v] allots three years, that is, 45, 46, 47, and somewhat more. For he placeth their setting out, and going to Salamis, in the year 44. Tillemont [w] thinks this journey might be performed in two years, that is, according to his computation, part of the year 44, all 45, and part of 46. From which time to the council at Jerusalem, next mentioned by St. Luke, might be, as he thinks, about five years. In which space of time, he supposeth Paul to have gone into Illyricum, and also to have preached "throughout all Judea:" as mentioned, Acts xxvi. 20, and likewise in Cilicia.

I likewise am of opinion, that this journey of Paul and Barnabas in the several countries just mentioned, might be performed in two years. I think they could not set out from Antioch before the beginning of the year 45, and probably returned in the former part of the year 47: but if any are rather for three years, and think this journey was not completed before the beginning of the year 48, I should not reckon it worth while to dispute about it.

But I do not see any reason to believe, that they undertook any more journies, before they went up to the council at Jerusalem. They might judge it very proper to make a long stay at Antioch, where was the first gentile church: as the other apostles made a long stay at Jerusalem, and in Judea. However, this church of Antioch, I suppose, with [x] Witsius, to have consisted partly of Jews, and partly of gentiles. Nor do I think that Paul and Barnabas would, as yet, extend their ministry farther than they had done, without an express divine appointment. What they had already done was a great deal; and must have exceeded the most raised expectations, till they had seen the event. Their stay at Antioch must have been very useful, probably expedient. It was proper to secure what they had gained. And they might there receive applications from the several countries in which they had been, and impart counsel and encouragement. If they had soon gone hence again, some might have arrived, that should unsettle the minds of new converts. We plainly perceive, that from Judea came several to see this new colony at Antioch. Some might come with good views, to encourage and confirm the believers there: or to satisfy themselves concerning the truth of what they had heard with great pleasure. But others might

[v] Annal. Paulin. p. 67. [w] S. Paul, Art. xii.—xv.

[x] Erat enim urbs Gentilis, et ecclesia ibidem collecta omnium prima, quæ partim Judæis, partim conversis Gentilibus constabat. Ubi supra, sect. iii. num. v.

come with a design to instil narrow principles, and disturb their minds with different sentiments from those which had been taught them by Paul and Barnabas. St. Luke, notwithstanding the conciseness of his history, has informed us of two visits made here from Judea, the first in the year 43, or 44, "when there came prophets from Jerusalem to Antioch," ch. xi. 27. Afterwards "there came men from Judea, who taught the brethren, that unless they were circumcised, they could not be saved," xv. 1. Of which more presently.

If Paul and Barnabas went any where, we might think of Cilicia: the rather, because we can perceive, that soon after this there were gentile believers there: though when Paul first preached in that country, we suppose him to have applied to Jews only. And it is well observed by Tillemont upon the case now before us: 'It [y] is certain, that chris-'tianity had been established among the gentiles in Cilicia, 'before the council of Jerusalem.' Acts xv. 23. Nevertheless, I should rather think, that Paul and Barnabas did not now leave Antioch, after their return thither, before they went up to Jerusalem. For some of Cilicia might learn the doctrine of the gospel by coming to Antioch. Or some of the prophets and evangelists of Antioch may have gone to Cilicia, with the approbation, and by the direction of Paul and Barnabas.

In this way of arguing I am encouraged by those words of St. Luke, just cited: "And there they abode long time with the disciples." We now proceed.

Acts xv. 1—5, "And certain men, which came down from Judea, taught the brethren: Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved. When therefore Paul and Barnabas had no small dissension and disputation with them, they determined, that Paul and Barnabas, and certain other of them, should go up to Jerusalem, unto the apostles and elders, about the question.—— And when they were come to Jerusalem, they were received of the church, and of the apostles and elders. And they declared all things that God had done with them. But (they said) there [z] had risen up certain of the sect of the

[y] As before, Art. xv.

[z] Many have mistaken those words, as if they were St. Luke's, who observed, that there were at Jerusalem some of the sect of the pharisees, who insisted upon imposing the law upon the gentiles. So thought Dr. Doddridge, Family Expositor, Vol. III. p. 233. So likewise Tillemont, whose words are these: Ils furent bien reçus à Jerusalem. Mais ils y trouverent les mêmes troubles, qui agitoient l'église d' Antioche, et dont ils venoient chercher le remède. Car quelques chrêtiens, qui avoient été pharisiens, vouloient qu'on obligeat les gentilis à la circumcision, et à l'ob-

pharisees, which believed, saying, that it was needful to circumcise them, and to command them to keep the law." Thus they delivered their message, and proposed the question, which they were desirous to have determined.

"And the apostles and elders came together to consider of this matter." Having in that assembly, after many debates, formed some resolutions, they sent them in a letter "to the brethren, which are of the gentiles, in Antioch, and Syria, and Cilicia," ver. 6—31.

Those determinations were intended for all believers in general from among the gentiles, containing, as it were, the terms upon which all gentiles were to be admitted into the church of Christ. But the epistle was directed, particularly, to the gentiles in Antioch, and Syria, and Cilicia, because among them the controversy had arisen, and they were the persons who had sent a solemn deputation to the apostles and elders at Jerusalem, to have their opinion upon it.

This journey to Jerusalem, related by St. Luke, Acts xv. I suppose to be the same with that mentioned by St. Paul himself, of which he gives an account to the Galatians, ch. ii. 1—10. Indeed, he mentions some circumstances, wanting in Luke, but, as I apprehend, they are not such as need induce us to think two different journies to be spoken of.

From Paul therefore, we shall endeavour to find out the time of it. "Then fourteen years after," says he, "I went up again to Jerusalem, with Barnabas, and took Titus with me also. And I went up by revelation." In the preceding chapter of the epistle to the Galatians, Paul had related his conversion in the way to Damascus, and then his "going up to Jerusalem, after three years, to see Peter, and abiding with him fifteen days," ch. i. 18. Where are we to date

servation de la loi. S. Paul. art. xvi. Grotius himself seems to have understood these words in the same manner. Sicut Antiochiæ quidam e Judæis facti christiani, ita et Hierosolymis quidam duriorem illam defendebant sententiam. Grot. in ver. 5. Whereas, upon due consideration, I think, all must be sensible, that they are not the words of the historian, but of the messengers of the church of Antioch, representing to the apostles and elders at Jerusalem the case, or state of the question, about which they were sent, and which they desired to have now fully resolved, and determined. This is the interpretation which Beza preferred. Hunc locum video omnes perinde interpretari, ac si essent verba Lucæ, quasi cum suam expeditionem narrarent Paulus ac Barnabas, insurrexerint, qui circumcisionem urgerent. Quod mihi non fit admodum probabile; sed potius illos, expositâ suâ expeditione, subjecisse controversiam illam Antiochiæ excitatam, cujus caussâ ipsi Hierosolymam venerant. Puto igitur, esse illorum verba, non Lucæ. Bez. in loc. L'Enfant follows Beza. And Whitby, if I do not mistake him, gives the same interpretation. And Dr. Doddridge, upon my telling him how I understood the place, readily acquiesced, as I well remember: for he was always open to conviction, therein giving a good example to all inquirers after truth.

the beginning of those fourteen years? at his conversion? or at his coming to Jerusalem, to see Peter? Pearson is clearly of opinion, that [a] the computation must be made from the time of his conversion. So likewise say [b] Estius, and [c] Basnage.

Says St. Paul, Gal. i. 18, "Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem, to see Peter." Those three years cannot be computed from his return to Damascus, out of Arabia, though it be the thing mentioned immediately before in ver. 17. But must be reckoned from his conversion. In like manner must be understood those words in ch. ii. 1, "then fourteen years after I went up to Jerusalem." We must take the same date or epoch for the "three years," and for the "fourteen years." They both begin from the same time, that is, St. Paul's conversion.

The council deputed with their epistle two chosen men of their own number, Judas and Silas, to go to Antioch, together with Paul and Barnabas, Acts xv. 22, 23. After they had tarried there awhile, Judas returned to Jerusalem, but Silas abode there still, ver. 32—34.

This council at Jerusalem, according to [d] Pearson, and, I suppose, many others, was held in the year of Christ 49. Basnage, supposing Paul to have been converted in 37, placeth [e] this council in the year 50.

As I cannot say exactly when Paul was converted, whether in 36, or 37, I am led to hesitate about the time of the council. But if he was converted before the end of the year 36, the council, as I apprehend, may be computed to have been held in the year 49. St. Paul says, Gal. 1. 18, "then after three years I went up to Jerusalem," *επειτα μετα ετη τρια*. Which, I think, implies full "three years," or somewhat more, as before observed. But the expression in Gal. ii. 1, is different. We translate: "Then fourteen years after I went up again to Jerusalem." *Επειτα δια δεκατεσσαρων ετων παλιν ανεβην εις Ιεροσολυμα*. Which, I think, may be thus rendered: "Then in about fourteen years, I went up again to Jerusalem." The "three years," above

[a] Anno xiv. a conversione S. Pauli congregatum. Hunc enim adventum suum narrat apostolus Gal. 1, 2, et tempus ipsum determinate exprimit.——— Quod autem apostolus ad epocham conversionis suæ referat annos, quos ibi narrat, manifestum est ex scopo capitis i. et ii.———'Deinde, post annos quatuordecim rursus ascendi Hierosolymam.' Idem enim horum verborum scopus, eadem annorum epocha. Vox enim *επειτα*, 'deinde,' non conjungit hæc verba cum illis de triennio, quasi a fine illius triennii initium sumerent. Aliud enim *επειτα* inter hæc et illa intercedit. Annal. Paulin. p. 89.

[b] Est. in Gal. ii. 1, 2.

[c] Ann. 50. num. iii.

[d] Annal. Paulin. p. 8, 9, 10.

[e] Ann. 50. num. xxi, xxii.

mentioned, are complete: but the "fourteen years" need not be so understood. And, probably, were not complete. If therefore Paul be supposed to have been converted in the year 36, this council might be held, accordingly, in 49.

This period, from Paul's setting out with Barnabas from Antioch, to go to Cyprus, in the beginning of the year 45, to their coming up to the council at Jerusalem, and returning thence to Antioch, near the end of the year 49, or the beginning of 50, is the space of about five years.

X. The next period will reach from this time to St. Paul's coming again to Jerusalem, when he was apprehended, and imprisoned.

Soon after the return of Barnabas and Paul to Antioch, Peter, as it seems, came thither, as related by St. Paul, Gal. ii. 11—21. Nevertheless, that occasioned not their making any long stay at Antioch. For, says St. Luke, Acts, xv. 36, "And some days after," that is, I think, after their being come back to Antioch, or after Judas had gone away to Jerusalem, and the controversy, which had been troublesome for some while before, was fully composed, "Paul said unto Barnabas: let us go again, and visit our brethren, in every city, where we have preached the word of the Lord, and see how they do. And Barnabas determined to take with them John, whose surname was Mark." By which we perceive, that Mark, who before had left Paul and Barnabas, and gone to Jerusalem, was now come again to this country, and was willing to have again accompanied them. Possibly, he came hither with Peter. "But Paul thought not good to take him with them, who departed from them from Pamphylia, and went not with them to the work. And the contention was so sharp, that they departed asunder one from the other. So Barnabas took Mark, and sailed unto Cyprus. Paul chose Silas, and departed——and went through Syria, and Cilicia, confirming the churches," Acts xv. 33—41.

I am inclined to think, that it was in the beginning of the year 50, that St. Paul now set out from Antioch. Pearson[f] likewise, and [g] Basnage, place it in the same year.

Witsius thinks, that [h] at this time Paul went from Cilicia

[f] Ann. Paul. p. 10.

[g] Ann. 50. num. xlvi.

[h] Ex Ciliciâ videtur Paulus in Cretam navigâsse, et, prædicato ibi evangelio, quoniam alio properabat, Titum reliquisse, ut 'quæ desunt corrigeret, atque oppidatim presbyteros constitueret.' Quæ Lucæ omissa, ex epistolâ ad Titum supplenda esse, et huic tempori optime convenire, opinatur L. Capellus. At Pearsonus ad postrema Pauli tempora refert, eaque ejus itinera, quæ solutionem ex vinculis Romanis consecuta sunt.———Capelli tamen rationes potiores hic mihi videntur. Non enim verisimile est, ad illud usque tempus igno-

to Crete: and that not being able to stay long there himself, he left "Titus, that he might set in order the things that were wanting, and ordain elders in every city," ch. i. 5. Pearson [1] placeth Paul's journey into Crete in the latter part of the apostle's life, in 63, or 64, after the deliverance from his imprisonment at Rome. But Witsius says, it is not likely, that the preaching of the gospel in Crete should have been deferred so long: when all Achaia, Macedonia, Asia, Cyprus, Syria, had been already instructed in the doctrine of the gospel. And he observes, that not long after Paul was come from Cilicia, he took Timothy into his attendance, to supply, as he thinks, the want of Titus, lately left in Crete.

Though I cannot say, that Paul now went from Cilicia to Crete, I readily own myself to be of opinion, that the apostle's journey in Crete was performed, and his letter to Titus written, before his imprisonment at Rome. But of this more hereafter.

Having gone through Syria and Cilicia, confirming "the churches, Paul came to Derbe, and Lystra:" where they had been before. Here they found Timothy, who, as may be supposed, had been converted, when Paul and Barnabas were there together. Timothy having a good character "from the brethren at Lystra and Iconium, Paul would have him to go forth with him," Acts xvi. 1—3.

Afterwards they came into Phrygia. And it may be reckoned very probable, that now Paul preached in the chief cities of that country, Hierapolis, Laodicea, and Colosse. He also went into Galatia, and there founded many churches. But they were forbidden to preach in Asia, properly so called. St. Luke's words are, ver. 6, 7, "Now when they had gone through Phrygia, and the region of Galatia, and were forbidden of the Holy Ghost to preach the word in Asia, after they were come to Mysia, they assayed to go into Bithynia: but the Spirit suffered them not."

Then it follows, ver. 8—10, "And they passing by Mysia, came to Troas. And a vision appeared to Paul in the night: there stood a man of Macedonia, and prayed him, saying: Come over into Macedonia, and help us. And after he had seen the vision, immediately we endeavoured to go into Macedonia, assuredly gathering, that the Lord had called us to preach the gospel unto them."

ratum fuisse Christum in Cretâ, quum tota Achaia———personarent evangelii præconio.———Deinde Derben et Lystram venit. Ibi in Timotheum incidit, fidissimum sibi abhinc omnium itinerum suorum futurum comitem, &c. De Vitâ Paul. sect. v. num. i.

[1] Ann. Paulin. p. 21.

By which manner of speaking we perceive that Luke was now in Paul's company. It is likely, that he met them at Troas. Which seems to have been the name of a country, and of a city, the chief of the country, situated upon the sea coast.

Ver. 11, 12, " Therefore loosing from Troas, we came with a straight course to Samothracia, and the next day to Neapolis: and thence to Philippi, which is the chief city of that part of Macedonia, and a colony. And we were in that city abiding certain days."

Samothracia was an island, over against Thrace, bordering upon Macedonia. Neapolis was a town upon the sea coast, on the Thracian side of the Strymonic bay, which separated Macedonia and Thrace. Here, I suppose, they landed, but made no stay. Thence they went by land to Philippi. Here they stayed some while, and several remarkable occurrences in that city are related by St. Luke. Lydia, a seller of purple, of the city of Thyatira, in Asia, attended to the things that were spoken of Paul, and was baptized, both she, and her household. She seems to have been a merchant, of no small dealings, and probably had with her many servants, and other attendants. Here likewise Paul healed the young maiden, said to be " possessed with a spirit of divination." After which Paul and Silas were apprehended, beaten, and imprisoned. But they were soon set at liberty. Whereupon they left that city, ver. 13—40.

" From thence they passed through Amphipolis, and Apollonia, and came to Thessalonica, where was a synagogue of the Jews," Acts xvii. 1.

Amphipolis and Apollonia were cities of Macedonia. And Thessalonica was the chief city of that country. Here being a Jewish synagogue, " Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three sabbath-days reasoned with them out of the scriptures.——And some of them believed, and consorted with Paul and Silas." Whilst he was here, believed also, " of the devout Greeks," that is, of the people of the country, who were well disposed, " a great multitude, and of the chief women" of the city, " not a few." But the unbelieving Jews made a great disturbance, ver. 2—9.

" The brethren therefore immediately sent away Paul and Silas by night unto Berea," where many of the Jews, and many of the men and honourable women of the place believed. But some Jews came from Thessalonica, and " stirred up the people" there also, ver. 10—13.

The brethren therefore immediately sent away Paul, and conducted him to Athens, with Luke, it is likely, the writer

of this history. "But Silas and Timothy abode still at Berea." St. Luke then gives an account of the apostle's preaching at Athens. The event was, that "some mocked. Howbeit some adhered to Paul, and believed. Among which was Dionysius, the Areopagite, and a woman named Damaris, and others with them."

Acts xviii. 1, 2, "After these things Paul departed from Athens, and came to Corinth: and found a certain Jew, named Aquila, born in Pontus, lately come from Italy, with his wife Priscilla, because that Claudius had commanded all Jews to depart from Rome."

The council of Jerusalem, as before said, was held in the year 49, or 50. And it was supposed by us, that Paul might set out from Antioch in the year 50, before it was far advanced. If so, he might come now to Corinth, before the end of the year 51. For as Basnage computes, the apostle's journeyings, after leaving Antioch till his coming to Corinth, need not take up more than a year and a half. I put below [k] his brief enumeration of all the places, which have been lately taken notice of by us. But he did not think of the journey into Crete, mentioned by Witsius, nor do I suppose it to have been then performed. This computation suits Paul's finding Aquila and Priscilla at Corinth. For he thinks that edict of Claudius to have been published in the eleventh year of his reign, which began on Jan. 24th, in the year 51.

At Corinth Paul tarried a year and six months, ch. xviii. 11, that is, as I suppose, the remainder of the year 51, and all 52, and part of 53.——"And then he took leave of the brethren, and sailed thence unto Syria, and with him Priscilla, and Aquila, having shorn his head in Cenchrea: for he had a vow. And he came to Ephesus, and left them there: but he entered into the synagogue, and reasoned with the Jews. When they desired him to tarry longer time with them, he consented not: but bade them farewell,

[k] Redux a synodo Paulus, post dies aliquot moræ Antiochenæ, mox in Syriam et Ciliciam proficiscitur. Quibus peragratis, continuo in Pisidiam, Lycaoniam, Phrygiam penetravit, haud longâ usquam morâ, ut verbo διελθων ostenditur. Hinc solvens Troade, per Samothraciam delatus est Macedoniam, ubi dies non multos exegit. Mox, per Amphipolim et Apolloniam, Thessalonicam, Macedoniæ metropolim, pervenit, ubi per sabbata tria disseruit. Motâ seditione, Beræam noctu petiit; quâ salutatâ, eâ discessit propter adventum Judæorum———et Athenas pervenit: quâ post aliquantulam temporis moram relictâ, Corinthum anno 51 ingressus est. Nostram non minimum adjuvat chronologiam adventus Aquilæ in hanc urbem, Româ nuper edicto Claudiano pulsi; quod probabilissimâ sane conjecturâ anno Claudii xi. promulgatum esse colligitur; ut a synodo ad peregrinationem usque Corinthum sesquiannus circiter elapsus sit. Basn. ann. 50. num. xxii. Vid. et ann. 51. n. lxviii. lxix.

saying, I must by all means keep this feast at Jerusalem:" meaning, as I apprehend, the feast of Pentecost in the year 53. "But I will return again unto you, if God will. And he sailed from Ephesus. And when he had landed at Cæsarea, and gone up, and saluted the church," namely, at "Jerusalem, he went down to Antioch. And after he had spent some time there, he departed, and went over all the country of Galatia, and Phrygia, in order," that is, visiting the churches, formerly planted by him in those countries, "strengthening all the disciples," ver. 18—23.

In this space of time, after Paul had left Ephesus, there came thither "Apollos, born at Alexandria:" who received from Aquila and Priscilla farther instructions concerning the christian religion, beyond what he knew before, and then went away to Corinth, ver. 24—28.

Ch. xix. 1, "And it came to pass, that while Apollos was at Corinth, Paul having passed through the upper coasts," meaning the country of Galatia and Phrygia, before mentioned, "came to Ephesus:" that is, as I apprehend, before the end of the year 53, possibly, in October or November.

I hope I have allowed time enough for all the journies hitherto mentioned, and that I have not brought Paul to Ephesus too soon.

Ver. 8—10. Says St. Luke: "And he went into the synagogue, and spake boldly for the space of three months, disputing, and persuading the things concerning the kingdom of God. But when divers were hardened, and believed not, but spake evil of that way before the multitude, he departed from them, and separated the disciples, disputing daily in the school of one Tyrannus. And this continued by the space of two years; so that all they which dwelt in Asia," strictly [1] so called, the country of which Ephesus was the metropolis, "heard the word of the Lord Jesus, both Jews and Greeks." St. Paul afterwards, Acts xx. 31, in his discourse to the elders of Ephesus, at Miletus, says, he had been with them the space of three years. Which may be a round number. Three months, at least, he had disputed in the Jewish synagogue, and two years in the school

[1] Atque hinc diversæ notiones vocis Asiæ oriuntur, ut latissima tertiam orbis terrarum Continentem sonet, Europæ ab ortu oppositam; latior magnam peninsulam inter Ponticum et Mediterraneum mare; lata Asiam cis Taurum, vel intra eum montem: deinde stricte est provincia proconsularis; strictius media pars illius provinciæ, circa Ephesum et Lydiam propriam; strictissime, Homericâ notione, parvus tractus ad Caystrum fluvium. Sacris scriptoribus significatio illa placuit, quam strictiorem modo diximus, uti ex iis, quæ varie adhuc dicta sunt, elucet. Cellar. Diss. de sept. Eccles. Asiæ, sect. ix.

of Tyrannus, and, possibly, somewhat more, making in the whole a good deal above two, which St. Paul might call three years.

I think that Paul might come to Ephesus before the end of the year 53, in October, or November, as before said. There he continued the remainder of that year, and the whole of the years 54 and 55, till the year 56, about Pentecost. However, let us observe the history.

From ver. 11 to 41, the end of the forecited xixth chapter of the Acts, is St. Luke's account of the special miracles wrought by Paul at Ephesus, and divers remarkable events, and then of a tumult raised by Demetrius, a silversmith, and "other workmen of like occupation."

Then Acts xx. 1—6, "And after the uproar had ceased, Paul called unto him the disciples, and embraced them, and departed for to go into Macedonia. And when he had gone over those parts, and had given them much exhortation, he came into Greece: and there abode three months. And when the Jews laid wait for him, as he was about to sail into Syria, he purposed to return through Macedonia. And there accompanied him into Asia Sopater of Berea, and of the Thessalonians, Aristarchus and Secundus, and Gaius of Derbe, and Timothy, and of Asia, Tychicus and Trophimus. These going before tarried for us at Troas. And we sailed away from Philippi, after the days of unleavened bread, and came unto them to Troas in five days, where we abode seven days."

There is not, perhaps, any part of St. Paul's travels attended with more difficulties, than this period of his leaving Ephesus and setting out upon his voyage to Jerusalem, with the collections made in the churches of Greece and Macedonia, and some other places. St. Luke is very distinct and particular in the account of the journey from Troas to Jerusalem. But from Ephesus to Troas he has mentioned but one city only, which is Philippi. Otherwise, as we have seen in the passage just transcribed, he speaks only of the countries of Macedonia and Greece.

We will therefore endeavour to settle the time when Paul left Ephesus, and then consider how long he might be in Macedonia or other places before he went to Troas.

After having related Paul's preaching at Ephesus, for a good while, and the success of it, St. Luke says, in the forecited xixth. 21, 22, 23, "After these things were ended, Paul purposed in the Spirit, when he had passed through Macedonia and Achaia, to go to Jerusalem, saying: After I have been there, I must see Rome. So he sent into Mace-

donia two of them that ministered to him, Timothy and Erastus. But he himself stayed in Asia for a season. At the same time there arose no small stir about that way:" meaning the tumult caused by Demetrius, as before mentioned.

Lightfoot has a happy thought upon this place. 'Paul's 'thoughts, says [m] he, of going to Rome argue the death of 'Claudius, who had banished all the Jews from thence; Acts 'xviii. 2; and that by the coming in of Nero, a new emperor, 'that decree was extinct, and freedom of access to Rome 'opened to them again. For it can be little conceived, that 'Paul should think of going thither, when he could neither 'find any of his nation there, nor himself come thither with-'out certain hazard of his life: as the case would have been, 'if Claudius and his decree were yet alive. It is therefore 'agreeable to all reason, that the death of Claudius, and 'the succession of Nero, were now divulged. And Paul 'thereupon knowing, that it was now lawful again for a Jew 'to go to Rome, intendeth to take a farewell journey and 'visit to Macedonia, Achaia, and Jerusalem, and then to go 'and preach there.'

Claudius died Oct. 13, in the year 54. It might be the beginning of 55, before the tidings of the death of Claudius and the accession of Nero reached Ephesus, upon which, or soon after, the thought of going to Rome entered Paul's mind. But he intended first to go to Macedonia, and Greece, and Jerusalem.

"So," says St. Luke, "he sent into Macedonia two of them that ministered unto him, Timothy and Erastus. But he himself stayed in Asia for a season."

By which we are led to think, that those messengers were sent into Macedonia in the year 55. After they were gone, came to Paul at Ephesus, from Corinth, Stephanas, Fortunatus, and Achaicus, 1 Cor. xvi. 17. By them he sends his first epistle to the Corinthians, written, as I suppose, in the beginning of the year 56. And it appears from 1 Cor. xvi. 10, 11, that Timothy, who, as before seen, had been sent into Macedonia, was also to go to Corinth. For there the apostle says: "Now if Timothy come, see that he may be with you without fear. For he worketh the work of the Lord, as I also do. Let no man therefore despise him: but conduct him forth in peace, that he may come unto me. For I look for him with the brethren." Paul therefore was in expectation of Timothy's coming to him at Ephesus. Which I suppose he did, before Paul removed thence. Paul says, 1 Cor. xvi. 8, 9, "But I will tarry at Ephesus until

[m] Harmony of the N. T. Vol. I. p. 299.

Pentecost. For a great door and effectual is opened unto me. And there are many adversaries." The Pentecost, there mentioned, I suppose to be that of the year 56.

Some time therefore in the year 56, before Pentecost, or about that season, Paul left Ephesus to go into Macedonia. So says St. Luke in his account of Paul's removal from Ephesus. He first mentions Macedonia, and then Greece, Acts xx. 1, 2. And from what Paul says, 2 Cor. ii. 12, it is argued, that [n] he did not sail away directly from Ephesus to Macedonia: but travelled by land to Troas, and then went over to Macedonia by sea. If so, he went now into Macedonia by the same way that he had done, when he was first there, Acts xvi. 11, 12.

But how long was Paul now in Macedonia and Achaia? or what space of time was there between his leaving Ephesus and Troas, and his return to Troas, in his way to Jerusalem? If it was a year only, or somewhat less, the passover mentioned, Acts xx. 6, and the Pentecost mentioned, ver. 16, were in the year 57. But if Paul's journey from Ephesus, round about by Troas, Macedonia, and Achaia, and Macedonia again, to Troas, in the way to Jerusalem, took up two years, or thereabout, then the Pentecost mentioned, Acts xx. 16, was in the year of Christ 58. And, if I mistake not, there are several considerations, leading us to think, that these journeyings took up more than the space of a year.

It need not to be doubted, that Timothy returned from Corinth to Paul, before the apostle removed from Ephesus. And that Paul left him there, will be manifest from that which is called the first epistle to Timothy. "As I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus, when I went into Macedonia, that thou mightest charge some that they teach no other doctrine," 1 Tim. i. 3. Paul therefore left Timothy at Ephesus for weighty reasons: and some time after his coming into Macedonia, wrote him a letter, for his direction and assistance in the arduous work lying before him. But Timothy was with Paul at writing the second epistle to the Corinthians. For it begins thus: "Paul an apostle of Jesus Christ——and Timothy our brother, unto the church of God, which is at Corinth, with all the saints in all Achaia."

[n] Sed quid interea Paulus, postquam Epheso profectus est, ut iret in Macedoniam? Per Minorem Asiam iter faciens, venit Troadem, nobilissimam civitatem, quæ adjacet Hellesponto; ubi quærens Titum, cum non invenisset, transmisso freto abiit in Macedoniam, 2 Cor. ii. Baron. ann. 57. num. clxxxv.

Paul ne s'embarqua pas à Ephèse; mais il vint à Troade dans le dessein d'y prêcher l'évangile. Tillem. S. Paul. art. 31.

That letter was sent from Macedonia, a little before Paul went to Corinth. But some good while must have passed between Paul's leaving Timothy at Ephesus, and writing to him, and this second epistle to the Corinthians. Paul, it is very probable, did not send for Timothy to come to him from Ephesus presently after he had left him there. I might add, that there must have been some emergent occasions, that induced Paul to call Timothy to him from Ephesus, where his presence was of great importance. What those occasions were Luke has not at all hinted. But they may be supposed. However, I do not now stay to hint what they were.

Paul in his second epistle to the Corinthians, ch. i. and xiii. 1, apologizeth for his deferring so long to come to them. But there could have been no occasion for such apologies, if he had come to them in the same year that he wrote his first epistle.

Paul says, 1 Cor. xvi. 5, 6, " Now I will come unto you, when I shall pass through Macedonia——And it may be, that I will abide, yea, and winter with you." But Paul did not abide and winter with them, according to this proposal, as here intimated. If he had, there could have been no ground for such apologies, as are in the second epistle. Nevertheless the apostle did spend " three months" with them, not very long before a passover. Which must have been partly in some winter. As they could not be in the year 56, when the first epistle to them was written, they must have been in the year after, that is, about the end of the year 57, and the beginning of the year 58. See again Acts xx. 1—6.

St. Paul says, 2 Cor. ix. 2, " For I know the forwardness of your mind. For which I boast of you to them of Macedonia, that Achaia was ready a year ago. And your zeal has provoked very many." Which plainly shows, that it was now above a year since writing the first epistle to the Corinthians, which was sent from Ephesus. For there he says, ch. xvi. 1, 2, " Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given directions to the churches of Galatia, so do ye. Upon the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store, as God has prospered him: that there be no gatherings when I come." These directions were then sent to the Corinthians. They therefore were not ready then. They could not be ready till some while after. And yet, at the time of writing the second epistle to them from Macedonia, they had been " ready above a year."

This shows, that Paul was above a year in Macedonia, or

near it. Moreover after sending away this second letter, Paul went to Corinth, and stayed there "three months," and afterwards went thence through Macedonia to Troas.

Consequently there was the space of two years, or almost two years, between Paul's leaving Ephesus and coming to Troas, in his way to Jerusalem.

As Paul did not winter at Corinth in the year 56, we are led to think of Nicopolis, mentioned, Titus iii. 12.

Before I proceed, I must take some farther notice of the words of 2 Cor. i. 15, 16, "And in this confidence I was minded to come unto you before," or first, "that you might have a second benefit: and to pass by you into Macedonia, and to come again out of Macedonia to you, and of you to be brought on my way toward Judea." Hence it may be concluded, that in the beginning of the year 56, before Paul left Ephesus, he once had hopes of getting to Judea in the year following, that is, in the year 57, probably at Passover, or Pentecost, and that he had been prevented. He then intended to go from Ephesus to Corinth, thence to Macedonia, and to return from Macedonia to Corinth, that by the christians there he might be brought on his way to Judea. But by some means he had been carried into a different course. He had not yet been in Judea: nor was he yet come to Corinth, though he had been in Macedonia. And, probably, he did not get into Judea before the Pentecost in 58. These words therefore must induce us to think, that there was a longer space of time between Paul's leaving Ephesus, and coming to Corinth and Jerusalem, than has been generally supposed of late.

Baronius says, that[o] during this period Paul was in Crete, as well as in Macedonia and Achaia, as does [p] Lightfoot; who also supposeth [q] Paul to have been now in Illyricum.

Dr. Benson[r] thinks, that Paul might say as he does, Rom. xv. 19, that he had preached the gospel from Jerusalem round about unto Illyricum, 'upon account of his being, 'and that more than once, in Macedonia, which bordered 'upon Illyricum, the Scardican mountains, and the river 'Drilo, being the boundaries between them.' And after the like manner Witsius, who thinks that[s] Paul did not intend

[o] Ann. 57. num. ccix.

[p] Lightfoot, Harm. of the N. T. Vol. I. p. 309.

[q] Ibid. p. 307.

[r] Upon the Acts, Vol. II. p. 174. first edit. p. 194. the second edit.

[s] Deinde iter fecerunt per Amphipolim, urbem Philippis vicinam, et Apolloniam, quæ est Corinthiorum et Corcyræorum colonia, civitas Illyriæ. Sic enim Stephanus.———Verum id nostræ nunc potissimum considerationis est, quod Appollonia urbs Illyrica sit. Pertinet hoc ad illustrationem illius quod Paulus Romanis scripsit xv. 19.———Multorum iste locus ingenia fati-

to say, that he had preached in Illyricum, for he only makes it the boundary of his labours. However, he says, that Apollonia was a city of Illyricum.

Wall, upon Acts xx. 2, [t] says, 'St. Paul did many great 'things in that nine months' time. [So he computes.] It 'must have been during that space, I think, that he made 'an excursion into Illyricum, and preached the gospel 'there.'

Mr. Biscoe delivers his thoughts in this manner: 'In [u] 'the same epistle he says: "From Jerusalem round about 'unto Illyricum, I have fully preached the gospel of Christ." 'Which is a general confirmation of the whole history of 'his travels in the book of the Acts. For in that history he 'is said to have gone through Syria, Cilicia, and most, if 'not all the countries in Peninsular Asia, to have gone over 'into Europe, and to pass through Macedonia into Greece. 'Now Berea, the last city in which St. Paul is said to have 'preached in Macedonia, could not be far from Dessaretia, 'which was part of the ancient Illyricum. At the same 'time I must own, it does not seem at all improbable to me, 'that St. Paul might, in one of his journies through Mace- 'donia, (for St. Paul relates his passing through Macedonia 'three times,) make an excursion into some of the nearer 'parts of Illyricum, and plant the gospel among them, 'though not taken notice of in the history of the [v] Acts. It 'is certain, however, that during St. Paul's life the gospel 'was preached even in the remoter parts of Illyricum, and 'not improbably by the apostle himself, after his release 'from his first imprisonment at Rome. For in his second 'epistle to Timothy, written when he was a second time 'prisoner in that great city, he informs him, that he had 'sent Titus into Dalmatia.'

gavit, non invenientium, quo tempore Paulus evangelium in Illyrico, quod supponunt, prædicavit.———Sed quid laboramus in cassum? Primo enim Illyricum non comprehendit Paulus suis itineribus, quasi id quoque evangelium prædicando peragraverit; sed Illyricum statuit itinerum suorum terminum. Venit enim ad limites Illyrici, quando venit Apolloniam. Optime Grotius ad Rom. xv. 19. Macedonia, quam peragravit Paulus, Dalmatiam attingit, quæ pars Illyrici, et ipsum mare Illyricum. In eo tractu est Apollonia, nominata, Act. xvii. 1. Wits. de Vit. Paul. sect. v. num. xi.

[t] Wall's Notes upon the N. T. p. 205. [u] Upon the Acts, p. 424, 425. [v] 'All that St. Luke says of his second 'journey is this: "And, when he had gone over those parts, and had given 'them much exhortation, he came into Greece," Acts xx. 2. All that is said 'of the third journey is, that whereas he intended to have sailed from Greece 'into Syria, knowing that the Jews had laid wait for him, he changed his 'mind and passed through Macedonia, ver. 3—6. At either of these times 'he might make an excursion into Illyricum, but most probably in his second 'journey.' That is a note of Mr. Biscoe at p. 425.

If I were to alter the latter part of that paragraph, agreeably to my apprehensions, it would stand thus: 'It is certain, that during St. Paul's life the gospel was preached 'even in the remoter parts of Illyricum, and more than probable by the apostle himself, and that before his imprisonment at Rome, when he was sent thither from Judea by Festus. 'For in his second epistle to Timothy, written during that 'his imprisonment at Rome, he informs him, that he had 'sent Titus into Dalmatia.'

The second epistle to Timothy having been written at that time, if any argument can be fetched from it, it must prove, that Paul had been in Illyricum, before he went to Jerusalem, and probably at the time which we are now speaking of.

It appears to me very probable, that at this time Paul was in Illyricum and Crete. But I cannot digest the order of his journies, since St. Luke has not related them. St. Luke says nothing of Paul's going to Troas. He only says, that Paul went from Ephesus to Macedonia, and then came into Greece. Though Paul was preparing for his journey to Jerusalem, with contributions of gentile churches, he was not in a hurry. Nor were those collections his only concern. Notwithstanding the tumult at Ephesus, he took leave of his friends there with a good deal of deliberation. St. Luke's words are, Acts xx. 1, "And after the uproar was ceased, Paul called unto him the disciples, and embraced them, and departed for to go into Macedonia." Nor does St. Luke represent the apostle in great haste in that country. For he says, ver. 2, "And when he had gone over those parts, and had given them much exhortation, he came into Greece."

It is now a common opinion, that [w] Paul did not go directly to Macedonia from Ephesus, but went by land to Troas, and there crossed over to Macedonia. It is evident, that before he wrote his second epistle to the Corinthians, from Macedonia, he had been at Troas. For 2 Cor. ii. 12, he says, "he came to Troas, to preach Christ's gospel, and that a door was opened to him of the Lord." There is no absurdity in supposing that St. Luke, who says nothing of Paul's having been then at Troas, and omitted the apostle's journey into Arabia, and indeed many other things, has omitted an account of his going to Crete and Illyricum.

[w] 'He did not go directly from Ephesus to Macedonia, that is, he did not 'take shipping at Ephesus; (that was not safe;) but escaped by land to Troas, 'as he says, 2 Cor. ii. 12, and from thence took ship to Macedonia.' Wall's Critical Notes upon the N. T. p. 205.

Wall, and others, who compute no more than nine months between Paul's leaving Ephesus, and coming to Troas, in the way to Jerusalem, may find a difficulty in admitting what we contend for. But I think I have shown it to be a space of almost two years, or about a year and three quarters. This alone will render it probable, that somewhat was done by Paul, beside what is mentioned by St. Luke, in Acts xx. 1—6.

St. Paul's words, in the epistle to the Romans, written at Corinth, in this period, are very remarkable: "So that from Jerusalem, and round about, unto Illyricum, I have fully preached the gospel of Christ.——For which cause also I have been much hindered from coming unto you. But now having no more place in these parts, and having a great desire these many years to come unto you"—ch. xv. 19, 22, 23. He seems now, as it were, at ease, knowing what he had done, and considering, that there was nothing more left to be done by him in those parts. And why should not Illyricum be understood in the same manner as Jerusalem? He had been at Jerusalem: and consequently, I think, in Illyricum likewise. And I should apprehend, that now was the time when Paul could first say so much as he here does.

Jerom had no doubt, but that Paul was in Illyricum. 'Christ,' says [x] he, 'was with Peter at Rome, with Paul in 'Illyricum, with Titus in Crete.' That opinion, it is likely, was built upon this text in the epistle to the Romans. Consequently, it is to be supposed, that Paul had been in Illyricum, before writing that epistle. Nor can any season be thought of more likely, than this period, between his leaving Ephesus, and coming to Troas, in the way to Jerusalem.

I suppose Theodoret to be of the same mind with us, and to confirm what we are now saying, in his comment upon Rom. xv. 19. 'He [y] shows to how many people he had 'preached: so that "from Jerusalem, and round about un-'to Illyricum, I have fully preached the gospel of Christ." 'As if he had said, I have not cultivated the nations in a 'straight line only; but going round about I have planted 'the doctrine of the gospel in the eastern countries, and also

[x] Erat igitur uno eodemque tempore et cum apostolis quadraginta diebus ———cum Thomâ in India, cum Paulo in Illyrico, cum Tito in Cretâ, cum Andreâ in Achaiâ. Ad Marcell. T. IV. P. I. p. 167. Bened.

[y] *Διδασκει δε και ποσοις εκηρυξεν εθνεσιν———ου γαρ τα κατα την ευθειαν ὁδον παρακειμενα εθνη εγεωργησα μονα, αλλα και κυκλῳ περιων, τατε Εωα, και τα Ποντικα μερη, και προς τϐτοις τα κατα Ασιαν, και την Ορᾳκην, της διδασκαλιας επληρωσα. Τϐτο γαρ δηλοι το κυκλῳ.* Theod. in Loc. T. III. p. 111, 112.

'in Pontus, and likewise in Asia and Thrace. That is what 'he intends by "round about."'

And Euthalius, in his prologue to St. Paul's fourteen epistles, reckons [z] Illyricum among the countries where Paul had preached, and says, that he converted a large part of it to the faith of Christ.

It may be not improper for us to give here some attention to the history of Aquila and Priscilla. They were with Paul at Ephesus when he wrote his first epistle to the Corinthians, in the spring of the year 56. For he sends their salutations in these words: "The churches of Asia salute you. Aquila and Priscilla salute you much in the Lord, with the church that is in their house," 1 Cor. xvi. 19. The Jews having been banished from Rome by an edict of Claudius, they came to Corinth, a short time before Paul. Acts xviii. 1—3. When Paul went from Corinth to Ephesus and Jerusalem, they went with him as far as Ephesus, and tarried there, ver. 18, 19. When Paul wrote the epistle to the Romans, at the end of his second peregrination in Macedonia and Achaia, in the spring of the year 58, (as we suppose,) they were at Rome. For Paul sends his salutations to them, Rom. xvi. 3. Afterwards they returned to Ephesus. For Paul sends his salutations to them in his second epistle to Timothy, then at Ephesus, 2 Tim. iv. 19, which epistle I think to have been written in the summer of the year 61, soon after Paul's coming a prisoner to Rome. And it has been supposed, that they continued at Ephesus the remainder of their life: which to me seems not improbable. It is likely, that soon after Paul went from Ephesus to Macedonia, which he did in April or May, 56, they also went from Ephesus to Rome. They might return thither, with a view to settle some secular affairs, they having before left Rome in a hurry, in compliance with the edict of Claudius. Or they returned to Rome with a design to continue there. For they seem to have had their family with them. Says St. Paul, in the place before referred to, Rom. xvi. 3—5; "Salute Priscilla and Aquila,——and the church in their house." Mr. Biscoe [a] explaining these words, "the church in their house," says, 'they had, it is probable, a 'considerable number of servants to carry on their trade. 'These, doubtless, were taught by them the christian faith: 'by which means they had a church in their house, where-'ever they settled.' And speaking of their being at Corinth,

[z] ——— πολλας μεν πολεις, πολλας δε χωρας περιενοτησεν, μικρῳ δε το Ιλλυρικον ἁπαν των της εις Χριτον ευσεβειας δογματων ενεπλησε. Euthal. ap. Zac. p. 520.

[a] Upon the Acts, p. 433.

he says, ' they [b] came from Rome, and settled at Corinth in whose house at Corinth St. Paul took up his lodging and wrought with them at their trade of tent-making.

What I would observe is this; that there is nothing in the history of these two excellent christians, Paul's helpers, inconsistent with the account which we have just given of this peregrination of Paul: which is to this purpose. Paul removed from Ephesus in the spring of the year 56, and went into Macedonia. But which way he went, I cannot tell, whether by the way of Troas, or some other course. He also was in Crete and Illyricum about this time. Having spent the winter of 56 at Nicopolis, either in Thrace or Epirus, he came into Macedonia, where he stayed some while. And near the end of the year 57, in November or December, he came into Achaia, and particularly to Corinth, where he stayed three months. Hence Paul intended to have sailed to Syria. But understanding " that the Jews laid wait for him," he returned again to Macedonia. " And sailed away from Philippi, after the days of unleavened bread, and came to his friends at Troas in five days." Acts xx. 3—6. That passover which Paul kept at Philippi we suppose to have been in the year 58. At Troas Paul stayed seven days.

It is not needful for us to pursue distinctly Paul's journey thence to Jerusalem, it being very clearly laid down by St. Luke, in the remaining part of ch. xx. and the beginning of xxi. I observe a few things only, ch. xx. 13; " And he went before by ship to Assos, [from Troas,] there intending to take in Paul. For so he had appointed, minding himself to go afoot." By which, I apprehend, we need not suppose that Paul walked all that way: the original word, as seems to me, importing no more than that Paul chose to go so far by land; whilst the rest of the company went by water. [c]

Ch. xx. 16, " For Paul had determined to sail by Ephesus, because he would not spend the time in Asia. For he hasted, if it were possible for him, to be at Jerusalem the day of Pentecost." As I suppose he was, though it is not particularly mentioned by St. Luke. So says [d] Lightfoot: ' St. Paul cometh to Jerusalem at the feast of Pentecost, ' when the city was now full of a confluence to that festival.'

[b] The same, p. 432.

[c] *Μεταμεληθηναι δ' αυτος εν παντι τω βιω τρεις μεταμελειας· μιαν μεν επι τω γυναικι πιστευσαι λογον απορρητον· ετεραν δε, πλευσας, οπη δυνατον ην πεζευσαι· την δε τριτην, οτι μιαν ημεραν αδιαθετος εμεινεν.* Plutarch. Vit. M. Caton. Maj.

[d] As before, Vol. I. p. 319.

Whereby we may be able to apprehend the greatness of the multitude of the people, as intimated by St. Luke, xxi. 27—36, and the extremity of the apostle's danger, and the terrifying circumstances of it.

We have now gone through a period of about eight years, from Paul's leaving Antioch, not far from the beginning of the year 50, to his coming to Jerusalem at the Pentecost in 58.

XI. I shall next observe the apostle's history from this time to his deliverance from his imprisonment at Rome.

Paul was about two years in Judea. He came to Jerusalem, as just said, at the feast of Pentecost in the year 58. And he was sent away to Rome near the end of the year 60. St. Luke's account of what happened to Paul in that space of time is in ch. xxi. 17.——ch. xxvi. 1—32. For when he had been a few days at Jerusalem, he was seized by a rude and enraged multitude, who would have killed him, if he had not been rescued out of their hands by Lysias, a tribune, and the chief officer at Jerusalem, under the Roman governor; who secured him in the castle of Antonia, binding him with two chains to two soldiers. But before Paul was carried into the castle, he made a speech to the people, as he stood upon the stairs going up into it. But the people not being at all mollified, and still showing great rage, the chief captain ordered that Paul should be brought into the castle. The next day he loosed Paul from his bonds, and brought him before the Jewish council. But a great dissension arising in the council between the members of it, the captain was obliged "to take him by force from them, and bring him into the castle." The day after, the captain being informed of a conspiracy to assassinate Paul, he prudently sent him from Jerusalem, under a strong guard, to Cæsarea by the sea side, where the governor Felix resided. After two years' imprisonment Porcius Festus came in the room of Felix, who, to gratify the Jews, left Paul bound. In a short time Festus brought his prisoner's cause to a hearing at Cæsarea. And the Jews still prosecuting him with great earnestness, Paul appealed to Cæsar. "Then Festus, when he had conferred with his council, answered, hast thou appealed to Cæsar? Unto Cæsar thou shalt go." A while after which, Paul, and other prisoners in that country, were delivered to Julius, a centurion, to be conducted by sea to Italy.

Whilst Paul was in Judea, he made a speech to the people at Jerusalem, already taken notice of, when he freely declared his principles and conduct. He was also brought

by Lysias before the whole sanhedrim, or Jewish council. He pleaded before Felix in answer to the accusations of Tertullus, and the Jews who employed him. He preached before Felix and his wife Drusilla, and was several times in the presence of Felix. And before he was sent away to Rome, Festus gave him an opportunity to appear, and plead before himself, and king Agrippa, and Bernice, and the tribunes, and principal men of Cæsarea: when Paul gave that august assembly an account of his doctrine, and of himself from his conversion to that time. And it is manifest, that Paul's discourse was well received. And both he and his doctrine were acquitted from all the charges and accusations of the Jews. For when the company had withdrawn, they said among themselves, where certainly they could speak with freedom: "This man doth nothing worthy of death, or of bonds."

Indeed, it must be owned, that Paul was civilly treated by all the Roman officers in Judea, Lysias, Felix, Festus, Julius. They all behaved as magistrates ought to do. They gave their prisoner and his accusers a fair hearing, that they might know the truth of the case. Felix was a bad man. Nevertheless, "he commanded a centurion to keep Paul, and to let him have liberty, and that he should forbid none of his acquaintance to minister, or to come to him," ch. xxiv. 23. And he left Paul bound, when he should have released him. But it was only out of compliance to the Jews, of whom he was afraid. And if there was any other defect of justice toward Paul, in the behaviour of the Roman officers, it may be fitly imputed to the powerful influence of the Jews, the people of the country; to whom governors, sent in from abroad, would be obliged to show a great regard, from political considerations.

In ch. xxvii. and xxviii. 1—16, is an account of Paul's voyage to Rome, which St. Luke has related very distinctly. As it was near winter when they set out, they met with bad weather, and were wrecked on the island Melita, now called Malta, lying south of Sicily. There they stayed "three months," xxxviii. 11, and then sailed for Italy in a ship of Alexandria. They landed at Puteoli, and so went for Rome. Paul and the other prisoners were delivered by the centurion to the captain of the guard. How the other prisoners were disposed of, is not particularly related. "But Paul was suffered to dwell by himself with a soldier that kept him," ver. 16. And as Paul had appealed to the emperor, I suppose that he was soon brought before him, and that the method of his confinement was ordered by the

emperor himself. Of which I may say more hereafter, when we come to the second epistle to Timothy.

Says [e] Lightfoot: 'His accusers, that were come from 'Judea to lay in their charge against him, (for we can hard-'ly suppose otherwise, but that some such were come,) 'would be urgent to get their business despatched, that they 'might be returning to their own home again. And so 'would bring him to trial as soon as they could.——As he 'appealed to Nero himself, so Nero himself heard his cause.' Philip. i. 13; 2 Tim. iv. 16.

So Lightfoot. And it appears to me very strange, that any should think Paul's cause was not heard at all at Rome, during his two years' stay there. And yet it has been the opinion of several learned men, particularly of [f] James Capellus, and [g] Dr. Doddridge, whose words I have placed below. And Fr. Spanheim speaks to the like purpose. But his sentiments are rejected by his friend [h] Witsius, as no better than trifling.

Paul came to Rome in the spring of the year, as all will readily think. Some learned men place his arrival there in [i] February, others [k] in April. Here Paul "dwelled two whole years in his own hired house." Therefore he was released from his confinement in the spring two years after.

I suppose Paul to have come to Jerusalem at the Pentecost of the year 58, to Rome in the spring of the year 61, and to have been released in the former part of the year 63. This period therefore is about the space of five years.

XII. We are now to write the history of our apostle from

[e] As before, p. 322.

[f] Redit Romam causam acturus, quod in primâ Romæ mansione non comparuissent accusatores. Jac. Cap. Compendios. in Apostol. Histor. Chronolog. Tab.

[g] 'After this, Paul continued two whole years at Rome in his own hired 'house, before he was heard by Cæsar, or his deputy, upon his appeal.' Upon Acts xxviii. 30. Family Expositor, Vol. III. p. 434.

[h] Celeberrimus Spanheimius noster ad Historiæ Christianæ seculum i.——hæc habet: 'Dimissus nempe fuerat Paulus, eâ lege, ut in Asiâ coram accu-'satoribus suis sisteretur, aut Romæ rursus se sisteret, quum ante nulli in ipsum 'Romam missi a Judæis essent. Eâ occasione adiit Corinthum.——Sed 'apparentibus Hierosolymâ Judæis, Romam redire coactus est, anno, ut vide-'tur, sequente; ubi conjectus in vincula; ibidemque ultima Pauli certamina, '&c.'——Quæ quam debili nitantur fundamento, non puto mihi esse ostendendum. Wits. de Vit. Pauli, sect. xii. num. xl.

[i] Ita Paulus, postquam per tres menses Melitæ hiemâsset, per Syracusas, Rhegium, et Puteolos, Romam venit mense Febr. Neron. vii. Pearson Ann. Paul. p. 18. A. D. lxi.

Ita tandem Paulus, post tot casus, post tot rerum discrimina, Romam venit, anno vii. Neronis, mense Februario. Wits. ib. sect. xii. n. i.

See likewise Tillemont. S. Paul. art. 42.

[k] Basnag. ann. 60. num. x.

this time to his death. But in this period we have no assistance from St. Luke, very little from the other books of the New Testament, nor very much from ancient authors, which can be depended upon as certain.

Whither Paul went after he had obtained his liberty, has been debated. Some think, that [l] he went from Rome to Spain. Others see not sufficient reason for that supposition. Among these are [m] L'Enfant and Beausobre, [n] Basnage and [o] Cellarius, and [p] Du Pin.

That Paul went into Spain, has been argued from an expression of Clement in his epistle to the Corinthians, who there says of Paul, 'that [q] having taught the whole world 'righteousness, and having come to the borders of the west, 'and having suffered martyrdom, he went to the holy place.' Which some have rendered "the utmost bounds of the west," and argue, that [r] hereby is meant Spain. I rather think, that Clement only meant Italy, or Rome, where Clement was, and where Paul suffered. From a note of Le Clerc upon the place we learn, that [s] Bp. Fell so understood Clement. The word "coming" also leads to this sense. If Clement had thought of Spain, or Britain, or any other places beyond that in which himself was, he would not have said *και ελθων*, "and having come," but *πορευσαμενος*, or some other equivalent word, "and having gone to the

[l] Adveniente Timotheo, ex Italiâ profectus est in Hispaniam, quo iturum se dixerat in epistolâ ad Romanos. Pearson. ib. p. 20.

[m] Quelques anciens pères ont dit, que saint Paul, ayant été mis en liberté, alla faire le voyage d'Espagne, dont il avoit formé le dessein cinq ou six ans auparavant. Rom. xv. 24. Mais, outre que ces témoignages sont du quatrième ou du cinquième siècle, il semble que ces pères n'ont parlé de ce voyage, que sur ce que S. Paul en a dit dans l'épître aux Romains. C'est au moins tout ce que S. Jérome allègue.——Aussi les épîtres, que S. Paul écrivit durant sa captivité, témoignent qu'il ne pensoit qu'à retourner en Grèce et en Asie, dès qu'il seroit délivré. Pouvoit-il avoir dans l'esprit un voyage en Espagne, lorsqu'il mandoit à Philémon, 'de lui préparer un logement?' Laissant donc une tradition, au moins fort incertaine, &c. L'Enf. et Beaus. Pref. générale sur les epîtres de S. Paul. sect. liv. p. 33. [n] Ann. 46. num. xlvi—l.

[o] Eruditis placet, et admodum est probabile, Paulum primâ captivitate, quam Lucas scripsit, liberatum in Græciam et Asiam revertisse, adeoque bis Romæ fuisse: in Hispaniam autem penetrâsse, credibile non est. Chr. Cellar. de Itineribus S. Pauli apostoli, sect. xxviii.

[p] Il arriva à Rome au commencement de l'an 61. Il en sortit au bout de deux ans. Plusieurs ont crû, qu'il avoit alors fait le voyage d'Espagne. Mais nous avons fait voir ailleurs que cela est fort incertain. Il est plus vraisemblable, qu'il revint dans l'Asie, et dans la Grèce. Du Pin. Diss. Prel. l. 2. ch. 2. sect. viii.

[q] *δικαιοσυνην διδαξας ὁλον τον κοσμον, και επι το τερμα της δυσεως ελθων, και μαρτυρησας επι των ἡγεμονων.——κ. λ.* Clem. cap. v.

[r] Et certe eam regionem vidit, quam Clemens Romanus, ejus itinera commemorans, appellat *το τερμα της δυσεως*. Pearson. ibid

[s] Romæ, hoc est in Hesperiâ, sive Italiâ. Fell.

bounds of the west." L'Enfant and Beausobre, in their general preface to St. Paul's epistles, say, "the bounds of the west" [t] signify nothing but the west. It is an expression, they say, borrowed from the scriptures, in which the borders of a country denote the country itself. In like manner by those words Clement intended Italy.

However, another ground of this opinion is what St. Paul himself says, Rom. xv. 24, "Whensoever I take my journey into Spain, I will come to you. For I trust to see you in my journey, and to be brought on my way thitherward by you, if first I be somewhat filled with your company." But Paul's measures had been broken by his imprisonment at Rome, and the consequences of it. And it was now at least five years since writing the epistle to the Romans. It is more likely, that [u] when Paul left Rome, he went into the east, and Greece. For in his letters, written near the end of his confinement there, he expresseth hopes of so doing. Philip. ii. 23, 24, speaking of Timothy, he says: "Him therefore I hope to send presently, so soon as I shall see how it will go with me. But I trust in the Lord, that I also myself shall come shortly." Compare i. 20—25.—— And he says to Philemon, an inhabitant of Colosse, ver. 22, "But withal prepare me a lodging: for I trust that, through your prayers, I shall be given unto you." And in the epistle to the Hebrews, probably written by Paul to the Jews of Judea and Jerusalem, he says, ch. xiii. 18, 19, "Pray for us.——And I beseech you the rather to do this, that I may be restored to you the sooner." And lower, ver. 23, "Know ye, that our brother Timothy is set at liberty. With whom, if he come shortly, I will see you." Moreover, it is not impossible, but that Paul may have taken care of Spain, by sending thither some of his fellow-labourers, whilst he was prisoner at Rome.

As I suppose the epistle to the Hebrews to have been written after that to Philemon, I am apt to think, that Paul came from Rome to Jerusalem, as soon and as directly as he could. But he made there a short stay only. From Judea I think it likely that he went to Ephesus, and there left Timothy: whom about two years before he had sent for

[t] Num. liv. p. 33.

[u] Nos tamen præcipue movent petita ex scripturis argumenta, quibus aperte liquet, Paulum egressum Romanorum carcere, in Orientem se contulisse. Documento sane magno, mutatum esse jubente Deo Pauli consilium, quo in Hispaniæ tractum ex civitate Romanâ proficisci statuerat.———Illud etiam nobis est vero proximum, peregrinationem Pauli Hispanicam ex verbis Pauli fabricatam.———Unde collegerunt, quod decreverat, illud executioni esse mandatum. Quæ tamen non est apta argumentandi ratio, &c. Basnag. ann. 46. num. xlix.

to come to him from Ephesus to Rome. From Ephesus Paul might go to Laodicea and Colosse. And, possibly, he returned to Rome by Troas, Philippi, and Corinth.

Some have hesitated to allow, that Paul ever came again into this country, because he says, Acts xx. 25, "And now, behold, I know, that ye all, among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom of God, shall see my face no more." But Lewis Capellus [v] has well removed that difficulty. I therefore have placed below a part of his observations. And says Wall [w] upon the place: 'Εγω οιδα, "I know," 'when spoken of things future, does not, (as it is used by 'St. Paul,) always signify a certain knowledge, or a pro-'phetic certainty: but often means only thus much: "I 'take it for granted: I am fully persuaded: I foresee it 'highly probable: I have no other expectation." And the 'like.' See also what there follows.

They who think, that Paul did come again into this country, but nevertheless was not at Ephesus, seem not to attend to St. Paul's expressions, who does not say to the elders of Ephesus: "I know that you will see me no more." But his words are these: "And now, behold, I know, that ye all, among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom of God, shall see my face no more." The apostle then thought, that he should never more come into those parts. Consequently, he might as well come to Ephesus as to Colosse: which he probably did, and certainly hoped, and intended to do. See Philem. ver. 22.

Beside Capellus and Wall, already alleged, I might refer to others, who hesitate not at all to allow, that Paul came again into this country, particularly Le Clerc, and L'Enfant and Beausobre, upon Acts xx. 25, and [x] Pearson. Not now to mention any more.

I said just now, that, probably, Paul went to Jerusalem, as soon as he could, after he was set at liberty. And say L'Enfant and Beausobre in their [y] general preface to St.

[v] Sed responderi potest, Paulum non semel ex humanâ conjecturâ, atque ex humano spiritu, consilio, et proposito, multa ejusmodi cogitâsse, putâsse, proposuisse, ac dixisse. Quæ tamen postea, Deo ita disponente, aliter ceciderunt. ———Itaque mirum videri non debet, si, cum Spiritus Paulum oppidatim moneret vincula et afflictiones graves manere eum Jerosolymis, sentiretque se Spiritu ligatum, ut eo nihilominus proficisceretur, nesciens quænam essent illic sibi eventura, desperaverit de reditu suo ad eos, quos post se relinquebat; licet, Deo ita disponente———res aliquot post annis ceciderit aliter, quam ipse tum credebat. Non est itaque tam validum adversus nos argumentum illud, ut eo subvertatur sententia nostra de Pauli reditu in Orientem, post soluta Romana ejus vincula. Lud. Capel. Hist. Apost. Illustrat. p. 34—36.

[w] Notes upon the N. T. p. 255.

[x] Paulus venit Miletum, &c. Ann. Paulin. p. 24. A. D. lxvi.

[y] P. 34.

Paul's epistles: 'We have seen, that the apostle was accus-
'tomed to go from time to time to Jerusalem, and to take
'the opportunity of solemn festivals. So long as the tem-
'ple subsisted, the Jewish christians did not neglect the or-
'dinances of the law. St. Paul himself did not neglect
'them, that he might give no offence to the Jews.' I readily assent to what they say about the apostle's going to Jerusalem. I could almost think, that Paul was desirous to go thither, to praise God in his temple for the favourable circumstances of his imprisonment at Rome, and for his deliverance from it. Paul's case at Rome very much resembled what had happened to him at Corinth. After [z] which we find, he had a vow, and went from Corinth to Ephesus, and hastened to Jerusalem, Acts xviii. 9—22. In like manner, I imagine, that now Paul went to Jerusalem, as soon as he could. But he made no long stay there. It had not been his custom so to do, since his conversion.

Having been at Jerusalem, I suppose, as before said, that he visited divers churches, which had been planted by him, and then returned to Rome. St. Paul, though a prisoner, had lived very comfortably at Rome. And he had there had great success in his services for the gospel. It seems to me, that he now considered that city as the most proper place for him to reside in the remaining part of his life. It was the most conspicuous place in all the world, and the place of the greatest resort from all parts. There he hoped to be more useful than in any other place.

But things do not always fall out exactly according to human expectations. For, as I suppose, the apostle had not been long returned to Rome, before he was called out to resign his life for the name of Christ.

In the year of Christ 64, as we learn from [a] Suetonius, and [b] Tacitus, heathen historians, as well as from others, was a dreadful fire at Rome, which continued six or seven days. It was thought by many people, that the city had been set

[z] A particular account of that journey from Corinth to Jerusalem may be seen in the first volume of this work, p. 219—225.

[a] Nam, quasi offensus deformitate veterum ædificiorum, et angustiis flexurisque vicorum, incendit urbem.——Per sex dies septemque noctes eâ clade sævitum est.——Hoc incendium e turri Mæcenatianâ prospectans, lætusque flammæ, ut aiebat, pulcritudine, Ἅλωσιν Ilii in illo suo scenico habitu decantavit. Sueton. Neron. cap. 38. [b] Sed non ope humanâ, non largitionibus principis, aut Deûm placamentis, decedebant infamia, quin jussum incendium crederetur. Ergo abolendo rumori Nero subdidit reos, et quæsitissimis pœnis affecit, quos, per flagitia invisos, vulgus christianos appellabat.—Igitur primo correpti qui fatebantur, deinde indicio eorum multitudo ingens, haud perinde crimine incendii, quam odio humani generis convicti, &c. Tacit. Ann. 15. cap. 44.

on fire by the emperor's orders. But soon after the christians were most cruelly treated by him, as if they had been the authors of the conflagration. So says Tacitus. The fire is said to have been begun on [c] the 19th of July. And the persecution of the christians began, as is supposed by some, in [d] November following, by others [e] in August. Which to me seems not so likely.

It is the opinion of [f] Pagi, and [g] Basnage, that Peter and Paul suffered martyrdom in the year of [h] Christ 65. They argue in this manner. Orosius [i] having given an account of Nero's persecution of the christians, and of the death of the two apostles in it, adds, that it was followed by a pestilence in the city, and other disasters. And Tacitus, [k] speaking of affairs, when Nerva and Vestinus were consuls, which was the year of Christ 65, mentions a pestilence in the city, violent storms in some parts of Italy, and other calamities. So Pagi. And Basnage [l] argues in the like manner from that passage of Orosius.

The last-mentioned learned chronologer likewise observes, that [m] Sulpicius Severus having given an account of the

[c] Fuere qui annotarent, xiv. Calendas Sextiles principium incendii hujus ortum, quo et Senones captam urbem inflammaverant. Tacit. Annal. 15. cap. 41. [d] —— cujus initium in medium mensem Novembrem A. 64, cadit. Moshem. de Reb. Christian. sec. i. cap. 34.

[e] Vid. Toinard. ad lib. de Mort. Persecut. cap. ii.

[f] Vid. Pagi ann. 64, 65, 67. [g] Inchoatam superiore anno persecutionem currente continuavit Neronis furor, qui Petri Paulique sanguine respersus est. Basn. an. 65. n. ix.

[h] That also was the opinion of Du Pin, not now to mention any others. Quoiqu'il en soit, il est certain, qu' étant revenu à Rome avec saint Pierre, il y eût la tête tranchée dans le temps de la persécution de Néron, et probablement la 65 année de Jésus Christ, comme nous l'avons fait voir en un autre endroit. Du Pin. Diss. Prel. l. 2. ch. 2. sect. viii.

[i] Nam primus Romæ christianos suppliciis et mortibus adfecit, ac per omnes provincias pari persecutione excruciari imperavit; ipsumque nomen extirpare conatus, beatissimos apostolos, Petrum cruce, Paulum gladio occidit. Mox acervatim miseram civitatem abortæ undique clades. Nam subsequente autumno tanta urbi pestilentia incubuit, ut triginta millia funerum in rationem Libitinæ venirent. Oros. l. 7. c. 7. [k] Tacitus lib. xvi. cap. 13. loquens de iis quæ Nervâ et Vestino Coss. gesta, sic narrationem suam concludit: 'Tot facinoribus fœdum annum etiam Dii tempestatibus, et morbis insignivere. Vastata Campania turbine ventorum, qui villas, arbusta, fruges passim disjecit, pertulitque violentiam ad vicina urbi. In quâ omne mortalium genus vis pestilentiæ depopulabatur, nullâ cœli intemperie, quæ occurreret oculis.' Petrus itaque et Paulus eo anno morti traditi, quo urbem pestilentia afflixit. Quare, cum, teste Tacito, anno Christi sexagesimo quinto pestis Romæ grassata fuerit, principum apostolorum martyrium perperam a Baronio ad præsentem annum dilatum. Pagi ann. 67. n. iii.

[l] Jam vero sæva hæc lues in Nervæ et Vestini consulatum incidit. Basn. ann. 65. n. ix. [m] Interea, abundante jam christianorum multitudine accidit, ut Roma incendio conflagraret, Nerone apud Antium

fire at Rome, and Nero's persecution of the christians, and of the martyrdom of Peter and Paul therein, adds: 'Whilst 'these things were doing at Rome, the Jews being uneasy 'under the oppressions of their governor Gessius Florus, 'begin to rebel.' Upon which Basnage observes: the [n] Jewish war began in May, 66. Therefore the martyrdoms of the apostles happened in the year before, that is, 65. To which, perhaps, might be added, that [o] Suetonius having spoken of the fire, the pestilence, and those calamities which are mentioned by Tacitus and Orosius, takes notice, that at the same time Syria was difficultly kept from breaking out into a rebellion: intending, probably, the uneasiness of the Jewish people in 65 and 66.

Basnage observes also, that [p] Epiphanius placeth the death of Peter and Paul in the twelfth year of Nero: part [q] of which, as he says, fell in the year 65.

I am the more inclined to this date, because we do not find in the epistles of the New Testament any notice taken of the persecution of the christians at Rome, or of the devastations in Judea, after the commencement of the war. If Peter and Paul had been in any of the provinces, and had survived the terrible persecution at Rome in 64 and 65, we should have had some epistle, or epistles of theirs, concerning it, to the Romans, or to the christians of some other place.

I do not presume to assign positively the year of the martyrdom of these two apostles. I have mentioned the specious and probable arguments of two very eminent chronologers, in favour of the year 65. Nor do I think the apostles survived that year. But I cannot say whether

constituto. Sed opinio omnium invidiam incendii in principem retorquebat, credebaturque imperator gloriam innovandæ urbis quæsisse. Neque ullâ re Nero efficiebat, quin ab eo jussum incendium putaretur. Igitur vertit invidiam in christianos, actæque in innoxios crudelissimæ quæstiones.——Hoc initio in christianos sæviri cœptum. Post etiam, datis legibus, religio vetabatur: palamque edictis propositis, christianum esse non licebat. Tum Paulus ac Petrus capitis damnati; quorum uni cervix gladio desecta, Petrus in crucem sublatus est. Sulp. Sev. l. 2. c. 41.

Dum hæc Romæ geruntur, Judæi, præsidis sui Gessii Flori injurias non ferentes, rebellare cœperunt. ib. cap. 42.

[n] Bellum autem Judaïcum incœpit anni sequentis mense Maio. Proindeque apostolorum martyrium in præsens tempus conferendum. Basn. an. 65. n. ix.

[o] Accesserunt tantis ex principe malis, probrisque quædam et fortuita: pestilentia unius autumni, quo triginta funerum millia in rationem Libitinæ venerant: clades Britannica,——ægreque Syria retenta. Sueton. Neron. cap. 39.

[p] ——μετα την τȣ ἁγιȣ Πετρȣ και Παυλȣ τελευτην την επι τῳ δωδεκατῳ ετει Νερωνος γενομενην. Hær. 27. num. vi.

[q] Pars autem anni Neroniani duodecimi ad præsentem spectat, utpote Octobris tertio et decimo incipientis. Basn. an. 65. n. ix.

their martyrdoms happened in the year 64, or 65. Pagi says, that [r] Peter and Paul were taken up and imprisoned in 64, and put to death in the year 65. But I know nothing of the imprisonment of the apostles at this time. There may be in late and fabulous authors large and particular accounts of their imprisonment, just before their martyrdoms. But there is little or no notice taken of it by the most ancient writers. If Peter and Paul were come to Rome before the city was set on fire, and before the persecution of the christians began, (which is not improbable,) they might be taken up, and soon put to death, before the end of the year 64.

[r] Præterquam quod, cum persecutio adversus christianos anno lxiv. decreta fuerit, ac insequenti continuata, non dubium, quin priori anno Petrus et Paulus in carcerem conjecti sint, ac posteriori necati. Ann. 67. num. iii.

END OF THE FIFTH VOLUME.

BUNGAY:
STEREOTYPED AND PRINTED BY J. R. AND C. CHILDS.

Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries
1 1012 01195 5939

DATE DUE

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.